United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2021 No. 189

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, teach us the mystery of life. Help us not to be victims but victorious in this season of challenge and change.

Lord, lead us to a place of understanding in spite of trials and tribulations. Empower us to triumph because You love us. Today, instruct our lawmakers as they seek to do Your will. Inspire them to focus on the priorities of Your providence.

Lord, show them Your truth so that they will be instruments of Your purposes. Transform their lives from a hurried succession of days into a walk with You that brings enduring peace.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, today, the Senate is going to continue focusing on confirming even more of President Biden's highly qualified nominees, both to serve in his administration and for lifetime appointments on the Federal bench.

Yesterday, we confirmed three more district judges through this Chamber, each with bipartisan support. We are going to continue today with two more nominees, and I hope we can see continued bipartisan cooperation.

In less than a year, Senate Democrats have worked swiftly and decisively to fill vacancies on the Federal bench with qualified, mainstream, and dedicated jurists. We are well on our way to making today's Federal bench the most diverse in a long, long time. Through September, at least three-quarters of President Biden's circuit-level nominees have been people of color.

Let me say that again because that makes me proud. Through September, at least three-quarters of President Biden's circuit-level nominees have been people of color.

Nearly a third of all of President Biden's nominees are former public defenders, and several of them have impressive backgrounds as civil rights lawyers, voting rights champions, and experience outside the well-trodden path of corporate law or Federal prosecution.

By focusing intentionally on confirming judges that bring both personal and professional experience to the judiciary, we are expanding the possibilities of who merits consideration to the bench at all.

Judges, obviously, are an essential component of a healthy democracy. We will strengthen the public's trust in a fair, independent judiciary if the bench better reflects the rich diversity of this country, while adhering to the rule of law.

One confirmation at a time, Democrats are swiftly restoring balance to our courts, and we are full steam ahead to confirm more mainstream and qualified and diverse judges as they become available.

BUILD BACK BETTER PLAN

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, on Build Back Better, Mr. President. Yesterday was another productive day as we make progress towards finalizing President Biden's Build Back Better plan.

After another vigorous, spirited caucus lunch, meetings continue with Senate colleagues and members of the White House, as well as with the President. An agreement is within arm's length, and we are hopeful that we can come to a framework agreement by the end of today; but we must—we must—continue working a little more to make sure it is the best deal possible for the American people.

I am working especially hard to strengthen Medicare and make prescription drugs more affordable. Senator SANDERS has worked hard to push for many of these Medicare provisions, and I support them.

At its core, the goals of Build Back Better are about restoring the middle class in the 21st century; helping people who are in the middle class stay there; helping people who are struggling to get to the middle class to get there; and give more Americans the opportunity for good, fulfilling lives and better lives for their kids. And, of course, we must take bold action to tackle the climate crisis, which could overwhelm our globe all too quickly if we don't act.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

It is an agenda that favors not those at the very top, but everyday Americans who are struggling to achieve the American dream in the 21st century. Unfortunately, the past 20 years in America have been a story of middle-class decline. Even before COVID, the Federal Reserve estimated that over 40 percent of Americans in this day and age would still—still—have trouble covering an emergency expense of just $400, which you can easily incur if you have to fix your car, make repairs at home, or visit a doctor.

A few decades ago, the story was very different. For much of the post-war era, most Americans had confidence that if you were willing to work hard, you could save a little and you could leave something behind for your loved ones. Nobody was guaranteed riches, but the basic bargain in America was that those who put in an honest day's work would be able to make ends meet.

Build Back Better is precisely—precisely—about rekindling that faith in the American dream. That is no easy task. Americans face serious, severe challenges today that did not exist in the past. Raising a family is more difficult than ever. The challenges of finding and affording childcare and pre-K have grown exponentially. Seniors are struggling to afford basic drug care and basic drugs.

These are not luxury items. These aren't handouts or entitlements. These are essentials. They are essentials that families need in order to work and get ahead, and they are oftentimes much, much harder to afford than they were in the past.

That is what we mean by providing ladders to the middle class and helping families stay in the middle class. That is what we mean by reviving that sunny American optimism, which this country has lost in the last few decades. We have got to get it back, and the only way we can get it back is by bold action that gives people renewed hope in their futures and the future of their children.

The work we do right now will echo far into the 21st century. This is the best opportunity we have had in a long time to make sure that the decades to come will offer the same—or even greater—opportunities that Americans enjoyed in the past.

And if Democrats keep working together, if we keep our eye on the ultimate goal, and we keep negotiating to find that legislative sweet spot, then we will succeed in rewarding the trust that the American people have placed on us.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in a few days, President Biden is set to gas up Air Force One and jet to Scotland for a global conference about the climate. According to press coverage, the President's agenda is clear:

''Biden Wants to Show the World He's Serious About Cutting Emissions.''

''Joe Biden gets real on climate change.''

What we are talking about here is a meeting to review a plan that failed to get its own signatories to meet its unenforceable ''commitments;'' a deal that couldn't compel the world's largest carbon producer, China, to commit to any less than another 9 years of rising emissions before it starts—starts—to turn things around. This is a country with single companies that emit more carbon than nations the size of Canada. Let me say that again. China is a country with single companies that emit more carbon than nations the size of Canada. And all the while, the United States, from outside the deal, cut our emissions more than any major country inside the deal. We cut our emissions more outside the deal than any of the countries inside the deal.

The Biden administration is desperately chasing bad deals to win applause from foreign leaders. That is what this is about: signing the American people up for self-inflicted pain for no meaningful gain.

The only thing that is serious about President Biden's environmental agenda is the trouble that it is already causing right here at home. Our adversaries like Russia are salivating over big windfalls while working American families are already feeling the pain.

Remember, on day one, this administration put a freeze on crucial development of domestic energy and killed the Keystone XL Pipeline, along with over 1,000 jobs. Combined with Democrats' flood of inflationary spending, it is no wonder consumers are facing the highest prices at the pump in 7 years, the most expensive home heating forecast in more than 12 years, and soaring prices on the household goods that are costing U.S. manufacturers more to make.

Ah, but wait. There is more. When President Biden jets off to next week's summit, his fellow Democrats will be busy plotting yet another reckless taxing-and-spending spree that would compound the pain with more anti-energy policies. They want to create new taxes on the most affordable and reliable forms of American energy that would put producers out of business, workers out of jobs, and make home heating even pricier this winter. They want to put billions more into ''environmental and social justice block grants,'' whatever that means. They want to subsidize the favorite products of blue State elites, like electric cars and even—listen to this—electric bicycles.

Democrats also want to pour billions of dollars into a made-up government work program they are calling the Civilian Climate Corps—Civilian Climate Corps. This is pure socialist wish-fulfillment. We already have a worker shortage and record numbers of open jobs, but Democrats want taxpayers to put aside $8 billion for make-work programs for young, liberal activists that they admit ''[wouldn't] measurably reduce emissions.''

Under their latest batch of proposed regulations, States that fail to keep pace with heavyhanded emissions targets would face ''consequences''—consequences like freezes on funds for major transportation projects that employ lots of American workers. They want to bully every State to become more and more like California.

Washington Democrats are plowing ahead with all this precisely as the Ghost of Christmas Future is providing us with a cautionary tale from across the Atlantic. All across Europe, natural gas prices have jumped 400 percent since the start of the year. Countries are scrambling to rediscover and reactivate the reliable systems they had left behind to follow the latest fads.

Thanks in part to the Biden administration's own inaction, Putin's Russia has turned his controlling share of European gas production into a political weapon.

But instead of heeding this cautionary tale, President Biden seems to want to follow suit. His regulations have squandered the energy independence we enjoyed before he took office. U.S. imports of Russian oil have doubled. As gas prices soar, his administration is reportedly—listen to this—asking OPEC to cut us some slack.

As one academic summed it up, ''Biden policy promotes a multiyear, multitrillion-dollar windfall'' for adversaries—you heard it—like Russia.

To raise energy prices while enabling Moscow to tighten its grip over Europe's energy supply is to turbocharge a Russian regime that was staggering and showing its age.

Pain for the American people. Payoffs for our adversaries so that President Biden can receive cheers from the crowd in Glasgow. Small comfort for his own citizens.

Energy policy isn't the only place where the Biden administration's decisions are hurting Americans. The President's retreat from Afghanistan continues to have dangerous and disastrous consequences. Yesterday, one Pentagon official gave Senators a new estimate of how many Americans the administration has left behind. The count Secretary Austin claimed last month—last month—was less than 100. That has now risen to 450 Americans left behind enemy lines. The Biden administration spent weeks insisting they only left about 100 Americans behind in Afghanistan when the truth was multiple times that. The administration has also continued to fail to keep its promises to brave Afghan allies.

Meanwhile, as many warned, the terrorist threat is growing in the wake of our retreat. The same Pentagon official

acknowledged that Afghanistan-based ISIS-K and al-Qaida terrorists have the intent and are acquiring the capability to strike the United States. ISIS-K could threaten our homeland in as little as 6 months. The Biden administration still doesn't have basing or access agreements in neighboring countries for its supposed plan to hit terrorists from ''over the horizon.'' No wonder our adversaries are testing this President's resolve to protect American personnel and American interests.

A complex attack against U.S. forces in Syria last week may well have been carried out at the behest of Iran. The administration isn't saying. They need to come clean about who is responsible and how they intend to respond.

We know Tehran badly wants the United States and its partners out of Syria and Iraq and to continue to threaten Israel and other U.S. partners. What we don't know is what the Biden administration plans to do about it.

Even where progress should be easy, this administration finds ways to actually mess things up. For example, there is strong, bipartisan agreement about the threat the People's Republic of China poses to international security and specifically to American interests—case in point: Beijing's recent publicly reported efforts to test hypersonic weapons and advance their nuclear capabilities. China is also dramatically expanding the naval capabilities that they openly use to harass other nations.

Both Republicans and Democrats would welcome a clear and coherent China strategy from this administration, but all we are getting is a muddled mess. A few days ago, no sooner did President Biden offer comments on his own Taiwan policy then the White House staff rapidly walked it back. So it makes you want to ask, who is in charge over there—the President or the Press Secretary? American administrations have a tradition of handling Taiwan with something called strategic ambiguity. I am afraid the Biden team is taking that a little too literally. Even they themselves seem to have no idea what they are doing.

President Biden likes to say something like: Show me your budget, and I will tell you what you value. But President Biden's own request for the defense budget didn't even keep up with President Biden's inflation. The White House proposed to cut defense funding after inflation. And here in the Senate, Democrats' partisan appropriations process seems to shortchange defense in favor of runaway domestic spending. Even their ostensibly China-focused bill from earlier this year would not have included any funding for the kinds of advanced defense capabilities that we need to keep pace if it weren't for an amendment offered by Senator SASSE.

Even the NDAA is stuck in limbo. The defense authorization bill is our most basic opportunity to shape security policy. It is a core duty for the Senate majority, the bare minimum, but Democrats have completely neglected the NDAA and the traditional robust and real floor process that it will need. They are too busy debating how much socialism to unleash on the country to look out for our troops, our veterans, and our national security.

This unseriousness will leave Americans less safe. It is just that simple.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVES SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Omar Antonio Williams, of Connecticut, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to seek unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of two very qualified nominees to USAID. They are the kind of nominees who, in previous Congresses, would have been approved, without debate, through voice vote. I will make the motion, expecting, unfortunately, an objection. Then I will proceed to comments on why I think this is incredibly damaging to the United States to not proceed forward with these nominees.

Thus, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nominations: Calendar No. 323 and Calendar No. 337; that the nominations be confirmed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order on the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, EcoHealth Alliance received hundreds of millions of dollars in taxpayer grants and contracts, including $65 million from USAID. This company and their research may well hold in their hands the smoking gun to getting to the bottom of COVID's origins, and millions of families who lost loved ones deserve closure.

Any Federal Agency that has given them money must be transparent and provide Congress all information on what EcoHealth used that money for. We asked for this information months ago. USAID has failed to do so, and that is why I am here to object to these two unanimous consent requests.

Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I would just ask unanimous consent for two incredibly qualified, noncontroversial Administrators at USAID.

Isobel Coleman is the nominee to be the USAID Deputy Administrator. She is a seasoned foreign policy professional who has been nominated by the President to oversee and provide strategic leadership over the Agency's programs. She has been previously confirmed by this body by unanimous consent. There are, as far as I can tell, no objections to her candidacy based upon the merits of it; and there were no objections to her candidacy to serve as our Ambassador to the U.N. for Management and Reform in December of 2014. She is a former Ambassador, and she has spent 20 years in the study and practice of global development. She has worked in the public and the private sectors.

I ask unanimous consent to proceed to the nomination of Marcela Escobari, the nominee for USAID Assistant Administrator for Latin America and the Caribbean. Ms. Escobari is a regional expert on Latin America and the Caribbean. She has previously served in the exact same role at the Agency, and she has done really incredible work reinforcing U.S. support work for Peace Colombia. She has been heavily engaged in the long-term development plan for Haiti, as well as in Congress's plans to double funding for Central America to try to stem the root causes of migration.

I think it is incredibly concerning that this blockade of capable diplomats, professional diplomats, continues on the Senate floor. By this time in the Trump administration, President Trump had had 22 Ambassadors who had been confirmed by the U.S. Senate, 17 of them by voice vote. Thus far, President Biden has had 4 Ambassadors confirmed.

Today, I was asking for consideration not of Ambassadors but of professionals who oversee the expenditure of U.S. taxpayer dollars abroad. There is nothing that Senate Republicans can do to stop the expenditure of taxpayer dollars in the Caribbean or Latin America. What they are preventing is the appointment and seating of individuals who oversee that funding, who represent us abroad.

This blockade—this unprecedented blockade—has never happened before in the history of the Senate. This kind of obstruction of standing in the way of the President's diplomatic team being seated compromises our national security. It makes us weaker as a nation.

As the President heads to the G20, he doesn't have Ambassadors seated to

most of the countries with which he is going to be conducting diplomatic negotiations and relations. USAID, today, only has two Senate-confirmed positions, leaving most of its top leadership positions vacant.

So forgive my sense of outrage when I listen to the minority leader come down to the Senate floor and chide the Biden administration for not having a strong enough policy in the Middle East when his minority is using its power to block Ambassadors to the Middle East and is using its power to stop an Assistant Secretary to the Middle East from being seated.

You can't have it both ways. You can't come down to the Senate floor and eviscerate the President's foreign policy and then deliberately stop him from having the personnel to conduct that foreign policy. It is like tying your buddy's hands behind his back and then criticizing him for not fighting back against a bully.

USAID is at the center of our COVID response. There is no way to protect this Nation from this pandemic or future pandemics if we don't have individuals who are confirmed at the top echelons of USAID.

I understand Senator MARSHALL's objection to be over questions he has about gain-of-function research that may or may not have been conducted in Wuhan.

What does Marcela Escobari—the nominee to be the USAID Assistant Administrator for Latin America and the Caribbean—have to do with gain-of-function research in China?

First of all, I can show you fact check after fact check that suggests these allegations about gain-of-function research being funded in China are false, but even if the Senator thinks there is a legitimate question, what does that have to do with our ability to efficiently spend taxpayer dollars in Latin America and the Caribbean?

We just had two massive national disasters happen in Haiti. USAID is managing that response. It is spending taxpayer dollars right now.

Why wouldn't we want to have somebody overseeing that spending? Why is that a responsible exercise of U.S. taxpayer dollars to deny our taxpayers the ability to know that there is someone, confirmed by the Senate, overseeing the expenditure of their money in places like Haiti?

How do you complain about the border and then deny the President the personnel necessary to oversee migration from the Northern Triangle northward to the U.S. border?

One of the nominees we snuck through was the Assistant Secretary for the Western Hemisphere, but USAID, right now, is engaged in programming designed to stabilize the economic and security environment in the Northern Triangle. I think both parties agree that this is a key component of our strategy to prevent migration that ends in crises at the border.

Once again, the Republicans are denying the President the ability to have personnel in place that will address the border crisis. Once again, the minority is denying the President the ability to have people in place who could oversee our COVID response. Once again, the minority is denying the President the ability to have people in place who will oversee our strategy in the Middle East.

This is an attempt to decapitate American diplomacy. This is an attempt to stop the President from being able to conduct the business of the executive branch. Never before has this happened. Never before has the minority used this amount of its power to slow down the confirmation of Ambassadors.

Yes, we can spend floor time on every single one of these Assistant Administrators, but we have never done that before. When it comes to somebody like Marcela Escobari or Isobel Coleman—people who are nonpolitical, who are unquestionably qualified to do these jobs—we have approved those kinds of nominations through unanimous consent. They have proceeded by voice vote because to require hours of debate on every single one of these nominees would be to gum up the works of the U.S. Senate.

That is why we have had this informal agreement over the years. It is in order to move these kinds of noncontroversial, nonpolitical nominees expeditiously. That agreement, obviously, has fallen apart, and the cost not only comes to the reputation and the comity of the U.S. Senate but to the security of the Nation.

You cannot complain about this President's foreign policy, as Republicans, if you are, at the same time, using extraordinary powers to deny the President the ability to have diplomats abroad to represent us. It is making us weaker as a nation, and it should stop immediately.

I am very sorry that the Senator from Kansas has come to the floor to object to two incredibly qualified, noncontroversial nominees to USAID. I hope this blockade comes to an end soon.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to complete my remarks before the start of the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECONCILIATION AND THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, it is another day and another really bad idea that is coming from the Democrats to fund their reckless tax-and-spending spree. It seems like, to fund this massive amount of spending, they are trying desperately to come up with new revenue sources, so much so that, as of yesterday, still under consideration was a tax on unrealized gains—in other words, on income that people haven't received yet.

Let's just put that into perspective.

If carried to its full conclusion and it became a precedent as part of the tax policy in this country—and it never has been before—to put it in terms for people to understand, a lot of people participate in the 401(k) or they have some sort of retirement plan from their employers. If there were a gain in a particular year—say that the total value of the portfolios of assets in their retirement plans, those 401(k)s, went up by 20 percent—they could be taxed on that 20 percent even though they haven't received the income yet.

That is what is being talked about here in terms of precedent. Never before has that been attempted or tried or implemented in American history, where you would actually have a tax on income before people actually ever received the income.

Of course, if you carry that to its natural conclusion, as we all know, markets go up and markets go down. If you had a year wherein your total value went down by 20 percent, then what? Do you get a refund from the Federal Government? My understanding is that they would offer some sort of a tax credit, in a case like that, if you had a year when you had losses.

Just think about the precedent that would establish, what that could mean for the American people, if at some point the government literally could tax you—tax you—on income that you hadn't received yet.

That is the latest really horrible idea which I think is being shot down by Democrats because they recognize what a horrible idea that is. But it is a good example of the desperate lengths to which Democrats are trying to come up with new ways to fund this reckless tax-and-spending spree that they seem to be insistent on trying to force through Congress. With an evenly divided Senate and evenly divided House of Representatives, it is hard to imagine that you could do something that radical, but this entire proposal is that radical, which is why they are having such a hard time getting even people in their own caucuses to agree with it.

Two years ago, Democrats introduced their original Green New Deal resolution. While the guiding principles of the Green New Deal was climate change and energy, Democrats didn't limit themselves to these issues. They outlined a radical, comprehensive socialist revamping of our society with the Federal Government inserting itself into nearly every aspect of American life. And while Democrats haven't advanced one all-inclusive bill to implement the Green New Deal—probably because of the absolutely staggering pricetag for a comprehensive piece of legislation like that—the Green New

Deal socialist vision has rapidly become an organizing principle of the Democratic Party. For proof, look no further than the tax-and-spending spree Democrats are contemplating with its massive expansion of government and radical climate agenda.

One major problem with the Democrats is they never fully consider the cost of their legislation, whether it is the actual dollar amount or other costs their proposals might impose. And nowhere—nowhere—is that more true than with the Democrats' tax-and-spending spree.

I have spent a lot of time on the floor talking about things like the way this bill will further drive up inflation and the dangers it imposes for economic growth. Today, I want to address some of the costs of the bill's Green New Deal-esque energy provisions, starting with the cost to American families.

We know some energy prices are increasing due to the rising demand from the lows of the pandemic. Yesterday's average price for a gallon of gas was $3.38. That is compared to an average price of $2.16 1 year earlier. Meanwhile, natural gas prices recently hit a 7-year high, and there are mounting concerns about supply.

Americans are paying a lot more to drive their cars, to heat their homes, and to cook their food. The high cost of gasoline and natural gas are two more reasons why Americans are finding that their paychecks don't stretch as far these days.

Given the situation, you would think that finding ways to lower energy costs would be among Democrats' top priorities right now, but you would be wrong. Democrats' tax-and-spending spree isn't going to lower energy prices; it is going to drive them even higher.

The new energy policies that Democrats are considering would drive up the price of electricity, natural gas, and gasoline and subsidize Democrats' preferred technologies with Americans' tax dollars. And the icing on the cake is that Americans are likely to be paying higher electric costs for possibly worse electric service.

A lot of Americans are familiar with the problems with California's electric grid—namely, blackouts. Well, if Democrats have their way, Americans around the country will be able to enjoy California-style electricity; in other words, expensive and inconsistent electricity delivery along with higher gas prices.

This is what I mean when I talk about Democrats not fully considering the costs. Nobody—nobody—questions that clean energy is a good thing. I have been a strong supporter—a strong supporter—of clean energy innovation. My State of South Dakota leads the way, whether it is wind energy, biofuel, or hydropower. Most of the energy generated in the State of South Dakota comes from renewable sources. In 2020, 83 percent of the electricity generated in my State of South Dakota came from renewable sources.

But clean energy policies need to be realistic and practical for each region of the country. We have to, for example, understand that we are not yet at the point, innovationwise, where we can rely mostly on intermittent renewable sources to power electric grids. We need reliable baseload power from sources like clean natural gas and nuclear. Additionally, forcing older electric plants to close before the end of their remaining useful life, especially the most modern and efficient ones, will strand those assets. Our utilities make long-term investments, and when they can't recoup those facility investments, they pass the costs on to consumers.

Overreaching clean energy policies that place heavy burdens on working families are unacceptable. Wealthy Democratic politicians and the wealthy donor class that supports them may not have to worry much if they have to spend more on their electric bill or an extra $20 to $25 filling up their gas tank. But that is a big deal to a family on a budget, especially when that family is also dealing with the increased price of food and other basics.

Thanks to inflation and other pressures on gas prices, Americans are already having to spend a lot more money to fill their gas tanks, and with the Democrats' tax-and-spending spree, many working families would end up unable to fill their gas tank when they need to in a diminished oil and gas sector. Maybe that is the goal of some of the more extreme members of the Democratic Party, but it is an unacceptable one.

Working families are likely to have a tough time thanks to the energy provisions in the Democrats' tax-and-spending spree, but wealthy families should do a little better. Not only are they more likely to be able to afford increases in the price of electricity and gas, but they will also be able to claim a tax credit from the Federal Government if they want to purchase an expensive electric vehicle.

Democrats' tax-and-spending spree will offer tax credits of up to $12,500 for the purchase of an electric car or truck with the biggest credit naturally going to those who purchase union-made vehicles.

That is right. Only electric vehicles produced at facilities under a union-negotiated collective bargaining agreement would be eligible for the $4,500 plus-up, which would take the credit up to $12,500. And anyone making up to $400,000 a year will be able to claim this credit.

That is right.

Under Democrats' legislation, you could be making nearly half a million dollars a year and still receive a substantial tax break for the purchase of an electric car.

Meanwhile, more accessible and readily available clean energy technologies—notably, biofuels—take a backseat in this bill.

Electric vehicles are Democrats' chosen winner in the transportation sector, no matter how impractical they may still be for a lot of working Americans.

Speaking of impractical, if you want an electric bike to go along with your electric car, Democrats will also give you a tax credit for that as well. Yes, the Democrats' bill contains a tax credit for electric bicycles—a credit that would go to bicycles that can cost up to $8,000.

Now, maybe it is just me, but if you can afford an $8,000 electric bike, I am not sure you need a tax credit for it from the Federal Government. Also, while electric bicycles may have their appeal in urban and maybe some suburban communities, they are a completely impractical option for most individuals in States like South Dakota. When you live 20 miles away from the nearest grocery store, an electric bicycle is not going to be your vehicle of choice for getting around. And I am pretty sure that South Dakota agricultural producers will back me up when I say that electric bicycles are not going to be much use for getting out to check the fences in the far corners of their ranch.

However, I have got to say that tax credits for electric bicycles are far from the most wasteful use of government money in this bill. That honor may have to go for the new tax credit to higher education institutions for teaching environmental justice programs. That is right. I am sure Americans will be relieved to know that Democrats are planning to create a new tax credit for higher education institutions—including Ivy league schools and other well-funded universities—so that they can teach courses on environmental justice, whatever that is. You would think colleges that charge students tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of dollars in tuition could perhaps afford to fund their own environmental justice programs. But, again, I guess you would be wrong.

Then there is the $3 billion the bill provides for tree equity—tree equity.

Now, I support and encourage the planting of trees, and I have introduced a straightforward bill to rapidly expand tree planting across the country without any Federal spending. But I am fairly sure the Federal Government cannot afford to spend $3 billion on tree equity, especially when Democrats need to save money for their civilian climate corps—a new government program to provide government jobs and subsidized housing to climate activists.

There is so much more.

The word is that Democrats will soon be releasing a new version of their tax-and-spending spree, and I can only hope that it will be less extreme than the current version because if the bill's current Green New Deal-esque energy provisions go into effect, Americans are going to be looking at a future of higher energy costs, diminished energy resources, and a weakened energy independence, not to mention a lot of wasted taxpayer dollars.

Once again, it is abundantly clear that the Green New Deal is a bad deal for American families.

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the Nachmanoff nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael S. Nachmanoff, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Nachmanoff nomination?

Mr. DURBIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 435 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	Kelly	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Luján	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Whitehouse
Graham	Ossoff	Wyden
Hassan	Padilla	
Heinrich	Peters	

NAYS—46

Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rubio
Boozman	Hoeven	Sasse
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Capito	Johnson	Shelby
Cassidy	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Cramer	Lummis	Toomey
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	Moran	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Portman	

NOT VOTING—2

Feinstein	Rounds

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the Nagala nomination.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Sarala Vidya Nagala, of Connecticut, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut.

VOTE ON NAGALA NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Nagala nomination?

Mr. KAINE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 436 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	Kelly	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Luján	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Whitehouse
Graham	Ossoff	Wyden
Hassan	Padilla	
Heinrich	Peters	

NAYS—46

Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rubio
Boozman	Hoeven	Sasse
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Capito	Johnson	Shelby
Cassidy	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Cramer	Lummis	Toomey
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	Moran	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Portman	

NOT VOTING—2

Feinstein	Rounds

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNOCK). Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 367, Omar Antonio Williams, of Connecticut, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut.

Charles E. Schumer, Ben Ray Luján, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher A. Coons, Elizabeth Warren, John Hickenlooper, Jacky Rosen, Brian Schatz, Tammy Baldwin, Patrick J. Leahy, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Richard Blumenthal, Benjamin L. Cardin, Catherine Cortez Masto, Cory A. Booker, Raphael Warnock, Alex Padilla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Omar Antonio Williams, of Connecticut, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 437 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	Kelly	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Luján	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Whitehouse
Graham	Ossoff	Wyden
Hassan	Padilla	
Heinrich	Peters	

NAYS—46

Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rubio
Boozman	Hoeven	Sasse
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Capito	Johnson	Shelby
Cassidy	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Cramer	Lummis	Toomey
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	Moran	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Portman	

NOT VOTING—2

Feinstein	Rounds

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 52, the nays are 46.

The motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss again the scheme by rightwing donor interests to capture

and control our Supreme Court, just like big industries have captured and controlled regulatory agencies through history.

In these speeches, I have covered the origins, motivations, and central players in the scheme; and, today, I am here to respond to a little bit of counterprogramming from the scheme.

So, obviously, Job 1, if you have captured an agency, is to pretend it is not captured; it is still legit.

Well, on Thursday, the minority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, one of the principal operatives of the court capture scheme, traveled to The Heritage Foundation, one of the central dark-money groups in the court capture scheme, to toast Justice Clarence Thomas, one of the most ardent justices in pursuing the scheme's donors' goals and purposes.

Senator MCCONNELL opened by lauding Justice Thomas for his campaign to overturn decades of precedent protecting women's constitutional right to abortion. That is an important point to note because the court is set to take up not one but two cases offering the new 6–3 Republican majority a chance to tear down Roe v. Wade.

But his other mission was to defend the court capture scheme, and that is an important mission right now because the court just hit an all-time low on Gallup's national approval survey. According to a poll out this month by one of the most respected pollsters in the country, about two-thirds of Americans think politics guides the Supreme Court's decisions. And that is not a partisan opinion. Republicans and Democrats share that view in equal proportion.

And Americans aren't wrong. When big Republican donor interests come before the Court, they win—it looks like every time. I have shown the pattern. I have published an article on it. It is currently at 80 to 0. Lawyers would love to take evidence like that—an 80-to-0 record—into court as pattern evidence of bias.

So when the evidence is bad, what do you do? You blow smoke. There is an old, old propaganda technique of accusing your adversary of the exact wrong you are committing. It is such an old propaganda technique that it even has a Latin name: the ''tu quoque fallacy,'' from the Latin for ''you too.'' The Oxford English Dictionary defines it as ''retorting a charge upon one's accuser.'' It is a rhetorical trick.

At Heritage, Senator MCCONNELL used this rhetorical trick, retorting a charge that critics like me of what has happened to the Court were trying to politicize the Court. Now, that is a particularly tricky version of this rhetorical trick because it is an accusation of something that we did not do, coming from people who actually did that.

We have all seen in plain view the mischief done by Senate Republicans to capture the Court for big special interests. They weren't even subtle. So the ''tu quoque'' rhetorical trick says to accuse us of what they did.

The Republican leader's rhetorical charge stood on a Supreme Court brief that I wrote, along with a number of my colleagues. And in that brief, we quoted a Quinnipiac poll. That Quinnipiac poll showed that a majority of American voters believe the Court is—and I quote the poll here—''motivated mainly by politics''—''motivated mainly by politics'' and the poll continued that those voters believed the Supreme Court should be—and, here, I am quoting the poll—''restructured in order to reduce the influence of politics.'' That is the language from the poll question. And in our brief, we quoted it precisely.

In his telling, Senator MCCONNELL leaves out the quotation marks and turns what was essentially an uncontested observation of fact of what that poll said, using the language of that poll, into what the rightwing has constantly replayed and cooked up as a threat to the Court. He also suggested that I had called for expansion of the Court, which I have actually not done. But never let the facts get in the way of a good story, huh?

In his telling, the majority leader's telling, it is Democrats who are up to no good at the Court. Let's look at what that telling leaves out because it masks a lot.

First, it masks the Court's partisan record, the record I have described: Justice Thomas and his fellow Republican appointees in the 5-to-4 and now 6-to-3 majority on the Robert's Court has handed down over 80 partisan 5-to-4 decisions benefiting easily identified Republican donor interests. Like I said, by my reckoning, it is an 80-to-0 record for the big donors. His telling masks all of that.

It also masks the entire Republican Court-packing operation that yielded three donor-selected Justices and hundreds of lower court judges during the Trump Presidency.

It masks the big donors' nominations turnstile at the Federalist Society, where they decided who would and would not become a Justice. It was insourced to the White House for it to vet and select Trump nominees.

It masks the dark money political attack groups, which used massive anonymous donations to apply political pressure on behalf of the donors' nominees.

And it masks Leonard Leo and the shady $250 million web of dark money groups outed by the Washington Post for packing and influencing the Court.

What else does it mask? It masks the influence operation built to steer those Justices' attention to rightwing donor priorities.

It masks the armada of amici curiae—so-called friends of the court—appearing before the Court by the orchestrated dozen, funded by dark money.

It masks the dark money front groups that comb the country for cases that can catapult selected controversies before the Court to help the Justices change precedent; it masks the special interest fast lane those front groups have established to get cases quickly before the Court, a fast lane the Court indulges; and it masks the hot house dark money so-called think tanks, like the Heritage Foundation where Senator MCCONNELL spoke, where legal theories benefiting Big Donor interests are planted and watered and fertilized and propagated for the Court to adopt.

And, last, it masks what Republicans did, shredding norms and rules that the Senate had long relied on to manage judicial nominations, the scrapping of the Supreme Court filibuster; the scrapping of the circuit court blue slip; the acceptance of preposterous assertions of executive privilege to hide nominees' records; the refusal to grant Merrick Garland so much as courtesy visits, let alone a hearing; the invention of the so-called Garland rule about not confirming Justices near an election; the mad rush to confirm Brett Kavanaugh under the cloud of barely examined sexual assault allegations; and then the hypocritical full 180 reversing that so-called Garland rule to jam a rightwing Justice onto the Court 8 days before an election.

This was all done in plain view. This was not subtle. You have got to be gaslighting really hard to not pay attention to all that evidence.

I will tell you what, we weren't the only ones watching. The American people are watching, and they are fed up with all of this. They trust their noses, and they know this reeks.

Senator MCCONNELL and I do agree on one thing. There are, as he said, ''storm clouds'' swirling around the Court.

I also agree with him when he said this; he said:

> One of our country's two major political movements has decided they're fed up with trying to win the contest of ideas within the institutions the framers left us and would rather take aim at the institutions themselves.

That statement is exactly true. It is just that Senator MCCONNELL got exactly wrong which party is the guilty one. Against that litany of interference and influence and dark money all around the Court that I just described, one misquote from a brief—it is not even a contest.

Here is a final quotation to set next to Senator MCCONNELL's. It comes from Lewis Powell a few months before he took his seat on the U.S. Supreme Court. In a memo he wrote to one of the most significant forces in Republican politics, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—a memo, by the way, that was never disclosed to the Senate during his confirmation proceedings. Here is what he wrote:

> Under our constitutional system, especially with an activist-minded Supreme Court, the judiciary may be the most important instrument for social, economic and political change.

Powell branded the courts a major element of what he called ''The Neglected Political Arena'' that Big Business and rightwing ideologues should

move in and exploit. Exploiting that is exactly what the rightwing donor scheme is. It enmired the Court in dark money influence. It packed the judiciary with judges selected to rule in the big donors' favor. It won an 80-to-0 rout of partisan decisions benefiting Big Donor interests. And it is steering the Court to protect the dark money that was the prime vehicle for capturing the Court in the first place.

Oh, yes, indeed, the Court has been politicized, but look at the evidence. We weren't the ones who did it, and no amount of smoke can obscure the evidence of how this Court became the Court that dark money built.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, after months of—well, I won't call it infighting; I will call it intraparty negotiating, our Democratic colleagues are still trying to reach an agreement on their multitrillion-dollar tax-and-spending spree legislation. They have yet to decide how much money they want to spend. I think they started—the Senator from Vermont started at $6 trillion, and then we heard it was $3.5 trillion. Now we are hearing that it may be more on the order of what the Senator from West Virginia said was his cap of $1.5 trillion. We still also don't know how much they are willing to raise taxes to cover the cost or how far they want to move America into a European welfare state.

Still, our colleagues are trying to reach a deal in a matter of days. Our colleagues are rushing to compile the largest peacetime tax hike in American history and see just how much government overreach those hard-earned tax dollars can buy.

Some Members experienced buyer's remorse before even swiping the taxpayers' credit card, so our colleagues are trying to scale back this massive spending bill. We read, but we don't know, but it is reported that they have cut certain programs, like free college, which, despite the name, we know that free programs actually cost money because somebody has to pay for them. We also read that they are scaling back other plans, including paid leave and the expanded child tax credit, to reduce the short-term costs and hope for more money down the line.

I think, if truth be told, once these policies are established, many times they are very difficult to repeal later on, which is why they are trying to establish a toehold even for a short period of time. But even with these pared-down proposals, there is still plenty of government overreach to go around.

One of the biggest dreams of our Democratic colleagues is government-run healthcare. We have heard the left embrace Medicare for All as its rallying cry. Well, the Senator who popularized that policy is now chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, Senator SANDERS, and he wields a lot of power when it comes to this particular tax-and-spending bill. It is no surprise that his top priority is a dramatic expansion of Medicare.

Initially, we read that our colleagues wanted to lower the age of Medicare eligibility by 5 or 10 years, making tens of millions of younger Americans eligible for this benefit. This, of course, comes at a time when Medicare is in financial trouble already. In just 5 years, the trust fund for Medicare Part A is scheduled to go insolvent.

It hardly seems right, while your boat is in danger of sinking, to add more and more people into the boat. Instead of fixing those problems or providing stability for Medicare, our colleagues want to spread those waning dollars even thinner.

The sky-high cost of expanding eligibility seems to have eliminated that provision. Again, this is based on reporting since no one has actually seen the documents, but a massive expansion of benefits apparently is still being discussed. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that this expansion would cost more than $350 billion in the first 10 years. We will see if the chairman of the Budget Committee is able to keep this provision off the chopping block.

But this is only part of the plan to put the government in greater control of our daily lives—of all Americans' daily lives. Another big-ticket item which certainly must poll well is free childcare. Again, nothing is free; it just means somebody—not you—is having to pay for it. But free programs, as it turns out, don't come cheap. In this case, the original pricetag was pegged at $450 billion.

The American people won't just pay more in taxes to cover this program; many families will end up spending more on childcare. One left-leaning think tank analyzed the impact of this free childcare bill and found that it is likely to have a devastating impact on middle-class families. According to the People's Policy Project, the Democrats' childcare plan would cause middle-class families to pay more than $13,000 more a year in childcare. That is not just a price increase for the top 1 percent; that is for people who earn more than their State's median income, which in Texas is just under $62,000. It is hard to imagine a family of four who brings home $62,000 a year having an extra $13,000 to spend on childcare, especially when they are already being pummeled by inflation and rising costs.

We will see all the ways that President Biden was wrong when he said that ''my Build Back Better agenda costs zero dollars.'' Of course, nobody believes that, but the President keeps saying it over and over and over again. But the American people are pretty smart, and they understand when the wool is being pulled over their eyes or when they are being sold a bill of goods by saying: Yeah, we are going to spend $3.5 trillion, but it is actually going to cost zero. It is really an insult to their intelligence.

Our colleagues across the aisle have also proposed a litany of tax increases on families, workers, and small businesses to cover part of the costs of this massive spending bill, and they hope the increase in the size and power of the Internal Revenue Service will make sure that Big Brother doesn't miss anything.

The administration wants to double the size of the Internal Revenue Service by increasing the number of agents by 15 percent every year for the next decade. Well, we have already seen what a politically motivated IRS can do. We know about the leaking of taxpayer information recently, and we remember the IRS targeting controversy during the Obama administration. IRS bureaucrats subjected conservative groups to a double standard when it came to scrutiny compared to left-leaning nonprofit groups, and it looks like the Biden administration may want to dust off that old playbook.

The administration also wants to give the IRS unprecedented power to snoop in your bank account. The administration proposed requiring banks to give the IRS data on accounts with more than $600 in annual transactions. So that means every time you bought a washing machine or a refrigerator, you paid your rent, maybe paid your mortgage, maybe bought a car, that information would be reported to the IRS. The IRS already knows how much you earn because that is reported, but that is apparently not enough for the IRS surveillance. They want to make sure that the IRS, like Big Brother, knows everything you do, everywhere you go, and who you associate with.

Well, this was a $600 annual transaction minimum, and, of course, that is for an entire year. It is easy to see how that would swoop up virtually everybody in this new government surveillance program. This obviously is not designed to catch billionaires evading their tax responsibilities. It is tough to imagine somebody who wouldn't get caught up in that threshold over the course of an entire year. A single month of rent is higher than 600 bucks in most Texas cities.

Well, we know what happened. The blowback was so fierce that our Democratic colleagues said: Well, it is not going to be $600 a year. We will up it to $10,000 a year. But, yeah, we will continue the surveillance of your personal private financial information just so we are sure we don't miss anybody.

Well, even at a threshold of $10,000, a widow who gets a monthly stipend from Social Security for $1,500 a month would obviously be a target of IRS snooping under this proposal.

It is pretty obvious this is a huge violation of personal privacy, and people are rightfully angry about it. I think people are angry because they don't want to be presumed to be a tax cheat by their own government. I have received letters from nearly 60,000 of my

constituents who are opposed to such massive government overreach and invasion of their privacy.

We know it is also an incredible financial and paperwork burden on financial institutions—community banks, credit unions, and the like. Imagine the time and the people and the hours necessary to comply with this new surveillance by your own government. Transmitting the sensitive financial information of almost every customer of a bank or financial institution to the IRS would involve a lot of time and a lot of money that these banks or credit unions may or may not have.

I have cosponsored a bill with Senator TIM SCOTT from South Carolina to prevent the IRS from monitoring American citizens' private financial information, and I was pleased to see our colleague from West Virginia, Senator MANCHIN, cast doubt on the future of this controversial and unnecessary provision.

The truth is, it doesn't matter if the pricetag of this bill is $5.5 trillion, $3.5 trillion, or $1.5 trillion; the goal is the same: to permanently transform America and the role that government plays in our everyday lives. Whether that is through the healthcare system, childcare, or through the IRS, there is no line too sacred to cross in pursuit of this ideological nirvana. Our colleagues continue working behind closed doors to determine just how much socialism they want to force on the American people.

We still don't know how much this bill will cost—again, nobody has seen it yet outside of the small group of Democrats who are actually negotiating—or how much harm it will actually inflict. But we do know one thing: This is not what the American people bargained for in the last election. The American voters elected a 50–50 Senate, reduced the Democratic majority in the House, and took President Biden at his word when he promised to work in a bipartisan fashion across the aisle. This is not what the American people bargained for. They did not vote to make Joe Biden the next FDR, and they did not vote to have this Build Back Better bill be the next New Deal.

We will continue, once we are able to find out precisely what is in this bill, to do everything we can to fight against this irresponsible taxing-and-spending bonanza.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

JOHN R. LEWIS VOTING RIGHTS ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 2021

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2021 in the expectation that the body will soon have a vote to proceed to debate on the bill, to proceed to debate in a forum before the American public, with an offer to our Republican colleagues to offer amendments, offer improvements, offer adjustments. This is incredibly important.

We had a vote on the Freedom to Vote Act last week, a bill that I am proud to be a cosponsor of, along with the Presiding Officer. And I am proud to be a cosponsor of the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act.

What does the John Lewis bill do? It basically does two things. First, it restores a vigorous preclearance requirement that was part of the original Voting Rights Act, section 5, that was struck down by the U.S. Supreme Court in 2013 in the Shelby v. Mississippi opinion.

The Supreme Court in Shelby said that you could have a preclearance requirement but you couldn't apply that requirement only to the geographic jurisdictions that were covered in the original 1965 act; Congress would have to analyze and come up with a new set of criteria for who should have to get preclearance done.

The second thing the John Lewis bill does is it responds to a Supreme Court decision that was decided this summer, Brnovich v. Democratic National Committee, to specifically lay out the elements of a claim under section 2 of the Voting Rights Act—a claim that a local election practice or a State practice dilutes the strength of minority voting.

The preclearance requirement is the one that is the most important to me because, as a former mayor and Governor of Virginia, of Richmond and then the Commonwealth of Virginia, I lived under preclearance requirements, and I will spend a little bit of time talking about what that is like because it is actually pretty easy and pretty helpful.

But the way the John Lewis bill, in my view, very adroitly fixes the Shelby problem is it says: OK. Starting now, we are not going to treat the South differently than anywhere else in the country; we will treat every part of the country exactly the same. You are subject to a preclearance requirement as a State government or a local government if you have had a pattern of Voting Rights Act violations during the previous 25 years.

If you had just one, that isn't enough. This has to have been a pattern. And if there has been a pattern of Voting Rights Act violations, you are subject to preclearance. You have to submit proposed electoral changes to the Justice Department, and you have to keep doing that until you have had 10 years in a row where you haven't been subject to any voting rights violation.

So it doesn't penalize the South. Every ZIP Code in this country—North, South, East, West, Midwest—is only subject to preclearance if there has been a pattern of voting rights violations—a significant pattern—over the previous 25 years. And as soon as you have 10 years without a voting rights violation, you can ''bail out'' of preclearance, and you don't have to submit your electoral changes to the Justice Department anymore, unless you commit new violations.

How reasonable. How reasonable.

We would want to have additional scrutiny of jurisdictions' voting rights practices if they have committed voting rights violations.

I was a city councilman and mayor of Richmond from 1994 until 2001. And every time we changed a polling place or did redistricting after a census or contemplated new rules about the timing in primary elections, we had to submit it to the Justice Department for a preclearance because Richmond—the capital of the Confederacy—had a documented history of suppressing minority vote for a very long time.

I was the Governor of Virginia—Lieutenant Governor and Governor—from 2002 until 2010. And the same thing at the State level: when we did redistricting after censuses, when we contemplated in our legislature new voting rules, we had to submit to the Justice Department, preclearance requirement. We would send it to them 90 days before the proposed change would go into effect. The Justice Department would analyze the change. And then they, almost in every instance, in my experience, would reach back out and say: That is fine. Your change is fine. You can go ahead and implement it.

Sometimes they would reach out and say: We have a question or could you think about this; might you make an adjustment? So it was a dialogue. And that dialogue was productive.

And then the Justice Department would give Richmond or Virginia a green light and we would make those changes and we would make them with some assurance. It was actually helpful. It was helpful to run a change by the Justice Department and have it looked at by voting rights experts to make sure that we weren't unwittingly, we weren't intentionally—but that we weren't unwittingly doing anything that would suppress anyone's votes.

And once we got that preclearance green light, we would move ahead with the voting changes with confidence. It was simple. It was easy. It was a standard practice that we were all used to. It didn't impose any additional burden or time on the city government or the State government.

And so it deeply troubles me that colleagues of mine now are reluctant to go back to a vigorous preclearance requirement for jurisdictions that have had an established pattern of voting rights violations. This preclearance fix in the John Lewis Act is extremely important.

Two more points. I want to plead with my colleagues in the GOP—the Republican Party—on this bill, and then I want to express my sense of urgency about it.

By my reading of our history, the Republican Party throughout most of its life has been a great voting rights party—a great voting rights party. In the aftermath of the Civil War, it was the Republican-led Senate and House that passed the 15th Amendment—the

constitutional prohibition against any jurisdiction using race to disqualify a voter.

I would like to say that the Democrats in the late 1860s were supportive of those provisions; it was the Republican Party, frankly, that got the Constitution improved by passing the 15th Amendment.

The 19th Amendment, pages, guaranteed women the right to vote. Now, that was done in a Democratic administration, President Woodrow Wilson, at a time when Congress was majority Democrat, but it was done with the full support of the Republican Party. The 19th Amendment had strong Republican Party support.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965, which the John Lewis bill goes in and amends—it was done at the time that Democrats had the majority in this body, but it would not have happened without Senate Republicans. In fact, Senate Republican were more supportive of the Voting Rights Act than were Senate Democrats in 1965.

So there has been a pattern—1870, 1919, 1965—of the Republican Party being a party through much of its life—being a party that was interested in expanding the franchise and encouraging more people to vote.

It happened again when Richard Nixon was President.

The 26th Amendment, pages, giving 18-year-olds the right to vote, changing the Federal voting age in Federal elections from 21 to 18, that was done under President Richard Nixon—again, with both Republican and Democratic support.

The Voting Rights Act, after it was passed in 1965, had to be reauthorized every 5 or 10 years. And it was often reauthorized by unanimous vote, with Republican Senators largely being on board.

It really only was about the time of the beginning of the Obama Presidency, frankly, that the GOP, which had been rock-solid stalwarts for expanding the franchise, began to change.

When the Shelby decision was reached in 2013, it was just a couple of years after the Voting Rights Act had been reauthorized with solid and overwhelming Republican support.

And this particular fix in the John Lewis bill to say, OK, preclearance; we are not going to put a scarlet letter on you if you are in a Southern State; we will have everyone precleared if you had a pattern of demonstrated voting rights violations—we went to Republican colleagues with that in a bill near immediately after the Shelby decision and were not able to find even one—even one—Republican in the House or in the Senate that would sponsor a fix to this bill.

It is my hope that when we call this vote up in the next couple of days that colleagues of mine in the Grand Old Party, who have had this more than century-long tradition of being a party willing to expand the franchise and encourage people to vote, will reclaim their own heritage and decide to be a pro-voting rights party.

Last thing, sense of urgency. I was not only the mayor of Richmond and the Governor of Virginia—a State with a significant African-American population and a State with a very notable history, a challenging history, a painful history, a triumphant history as well; like most history, Virginia history is so mixed; there is so much pain and tragedy and triumph and hard to make sense out of it—but I have always been passionate for voting rights because of my understanding of our history and, particularly, the disenfranchisement that African Americans, women, and others have faced.

One thing I have never faced, though, is I have never faced disenfranchisement. I have been a supporter of voting rights for those who have. I was a civil rights lawyer. I did voting rights cases. So I have been a supporter. I have been an ally. I have been an advocate. But never in my life—never in my life—did I feel like TIM KAINE, a Caucasian male born in 1958—that somebody was trying to disenfranchise me.

I had that experience for 1 day of my life. And as passionate as I was before that 1 day, I now understand this in a completely different way. That day was January 6, 2021. As we were here in the Capitol and the Capitol was under attack by people who were attacking to try to stop the certification of the November 2020 election, they were basically trying to disenfranchise 81 million people who had voted for Joe Biden and KAMALA HARRIS.

And my overwhelming reaction that day was complicated, and I was having a hard time figuring out what I was feeling. Even when we heard gunshots, even when we were being escorted and could see the rampagers not far from us, I was not afraid; I was furious. I wasn't feeling fear; I was feeling anger. And I realized later that that anger stemmed from the fact that at age 62, almost 63, for the first time in my life, just for a moment, I had a sense of what it meant to have someone else trying to disenfranchise me.

Many of my friends and constituents in Richmond—they have felt that sense for their entire lives. They felt it very personally. They feel it very personally. They hate that feeling. They want us to be that small ''d'' democracy, where everyone can participate. I had never felt that personally, but on that day, I did. And that day gave me just a glimpse—just a glimpse—of how devastating, demoralizing, frightening, angering it is to know that society is trying to keep you away from participation.

So that experience, which was just for a day because on January 7 I was back to my norm, where no one was trying to disenfranchise me—and yet those actions that are being taken in statehouses around this country to take away people's rights to participate, they mean something different to me than they did on January 5 because I had that one moment where I felt like this is me.

I sort of hated that day, but if it took that day to help me realize the importance of this issue, then that day had a purpose in my life that was not just a negative purpose, a positive one. And it is my deep hope that both parties, as we have before—Democrats and Republicans—will join together to protect people's rights to participate in this greatest democracy on Earth.

I look forward to this debate. I look forward to getting a voting rights protection measure that is meaningful through this body, as has happened before. If we can do it here, we will be honoring a history, where, even when it has been tough, we have been able to do it. And we can do it again.

And with that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, beginning in his first days in office, President Biden paused all oil and gas leasing on Federal lands and then killed the thousands of jobs supported by the Keystone XL Pipeline. Fast forward to today, prices at the pump are more than 40 percent increased from a year ago. Home heating costs have increased by more than 20 percent going into the winter.

Under President Biden's new policies, instead of reducing this burden on hard-working Arkansans, President Biden has made it clear that his agenda trumps the needs of American families and is doubling down with his new reckless, energy-destroying spending bill that will only increase these costs.

This far-left Democrat wish list makes the undeliverable promises, proposes to dramatically drive up costs for every American, would eliminate thousands of jobs in the energy sector, and would accelerate our already rapid inflation.

This is not a realistic approach to address our country's environmental energy needs. Heavyhanded rules that reduced energy supplies are likewise counterproductive.

We should not turn our back on the existing energy sources that we have in North America that lower gas prices and reduce our dependence on oil from unstable regions. American manufacturers need long-term access to affordable energy so our country can compete globally against nations with much lower environmental standards. Also, in the event of a national security or energy crisis, for example, access to our resources will be essential.

Bureaucratic overreach and unwarranted spending will not only drive up energy costs on consumers but will also do the most harm to low- and middle-income families. Think of the impact this would have on single moms and seniors on fixed incomes. These families are most affected by burdensome regulations and can least afford a costly, unworkable energy policy.

We must continue to use an all-of-the-above approach to diversify our Nation's energy portfolio. Working to increase exploration and production of natural gas and oil, continuing the development and use of coal, along with support for renewable and nuclear energy, should all play a role in our national energy strategy. America's energy supply should be diverse, stable, and affordable.

President Biden is pushing hard to get Congress to agree to his plans in time for this week's climate summit. It is fitting that the summit is in Scotland, as European nations have shown us the dangers in addressing climate change the wrong way.

Poorly conceived mandates to eliminate fossil fuels have resulted in a cavalcade of problems for agriculture across the continent.

Surging natural gas prices have resulted in fertilizer plants closing, created a food-grade CO_2 shortage crisis that is hurting pork and poultry processing. Beverage producers are also facing the same challenge getting CO_2, leading to the likely scenario of widespread disruption across the food and beverage sector.

Our friends in the UK went heavy on wind power only to have the wind stop blowing, forcing energy companies to scramble for gas reserves, and consumers to face much higher bills.

As ranking member on the Agriculture Committee, I take these warnings very, very seriously. The President's plan would be an absolute gut punch to our Nation's family farmers and rural America as a whole, especially as inflation continues to skyrocket under this administration's watch.

The cost of farming is on the rise. Land, fuel, seed, fertilizer, and livestock feed prices are all increasing. Soaring costs of inputs come at a time when the farm economy had only recently begun to turn a corner. Now with further increases, farmers, once again, face the possibility of a downturn in the farm economy as profits dwindle.

Propane—heavily relied upon in rural America for agricultural production and home heating—has seen prices almost double this year. In fact, market experts are predicting an ''Armageddon'' as we head toward the winter. Now President Biden and his allies in Congress would enact policies that double down on economic hardship by eliminating affordable sources of energy, particularly those relied upon in rural America.

Much of the President's agenda comes directly from the Green New Deal, a far-left agenda that most Americans have roundly rejected. Working with President Trump, we successfully fought off the Green New Deal. Now President Biden wants to resurrect it and rebrand it as ''Build Back Better.''

Given the troubles Democrats have had writing their bill, it seems that America doesn't want it either.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, a number of us are down on the Senate floor here talking about the disastrous Biden administration policies that from day one—day one—have sought to increase energy prices and put American workers out of work.

How have they been doing that?

Well, they are shutting down the production of American energy. All over the country, they are going after infrastructure, particularly pipelines, not allowing those to be built.

They have energy or climate czars not confirmed by the Senate—John Kerry, Gina McCarthy—who are going to financial intuitions in America saying: Don't invest in American energy.

And then we are hearing reports that John Kerry is going to countries in Asia, saying: Don't buy American LNG.

You can't make this stuff up.

Two days ago in the Washington Post, another story. John Kerry was saying to President Biden: Hey, we have to be softer on China so we can get them to maybe commit a promise that they will never keep in Scotland.

You can't make this up. Let's be soft. The Chinese are mad about us raising issues about Hong Kong and Taiwan. John Kerry is saying maybe we should tone that down to get the Communist Party of China to agree to some empty promises on climate. You can't make this up.

So what we are seeing is spiking energy prices at the pump for working families. Here is the question everybody should be asking—I hope our friends in the media ask it, certainly—of the Biden administration: Is this intentional? Are you really trying to drive up energy prices that is hurting working families?

My view is, I think the answer is yes.

The President had a townhall last week. He seemed to not have a clue about a bunch of issues, but particularly on energy prices.

And just yesterday, there was an article about how Gina McCarthy was quoted as saying there will be opportunities with these high energy prices:

> Soaring commodity prices stemming from a surge in energy demand and limited supply, should accelerate the move to renewables around the world.

This is a senior Biden administration official saying: Hey, we are actually trying to drive these prices up. Sorry, working families in America. Winter is coming. You are really going to be hurting. Maybe the world will move to renewables.

You can't make this up.

To me, this is one of the biggest betrayals of working families and working men and women in U.S. history: an administration coming in on purpose to drive up energy prices—Gina McCarthy says so—knowing it is going to hurt working families.

Heck, I wouldn't be surprised if President Biden will be calling on our citizens to wear a Jimmy Carter-style cardigan soon.

What they are doing is building back better to the seventies: high inflation; gas lines; high energy prices; empty shelves; lack of workers; energy-producing adversaries, like Russia, empowered; begging OPEC to produce more oil. That is literally what is going on.

Madam President, we have a much better plan. In the next few weeks, some of my colleagues—Senator CRAMER, Senator LUMMIS, and a number of others—we are going to be putting forward a plan on what is working. We need to build on what is working in America.

Let me give you a couple of statistics that matter. Since 2005, the United States has reduced greenhouse gas emissions by almost 15 percent, more than any other major economy in the world. That is a fact. You don't hear it from President Biden. Heck, the Secretary of Energy thinks we are the sinner. They don't recognize China as producing almost three times the amount of greenhouse gas emissions than we are. Estimates are that 100 percent of the increase in global greenhouse gas emissions are going to come from non-industrialized countries—China, India, others—yet they are putting all the pain on Americans.

If we export and continue to export clean-burning American natural gas as we currently do to India, to China, to Korea, to Japan, that could have a huge impact on reducing global greenhouse gas emissions.

So what we are going to be doing is we are going to be working with others—we certainly want some of our Democratic colleagues to join this commonsense approach.

The American Energy, Jobs, and Climate Plan is focused on all-of-the-above energy using technology—yes, building out the renewable sector in conjunction with our other energy that we currently have; empowering American workers; not giving him and her pink slips, which is the Biden way; enacting reform; knowing that we need other resources, like critical minerals that we have in abundance in Alaska and America, for the renewable sector; permanent reform so we can bring all energy projects online—oil, gas, renewable, nuclear, all of the above. That is the power; and, of course, using our resources to leverage our foreign policy advantage over our allies.

As we start rolling out our plan, we need to compare it with the Biden Green New Deal. We need to compare it with the Biden Green New Deal. Just look at the comparison, what we are going to be doing over here in the blue with our plan and what the President and his team—no offense to some of my colleagues, led by a number of them—on the Green New Deal.

We will create millions of jobs. They are putting people out of work as we speak.

We have the ability to reduce global greenhouse gas emissions. They are

going to China to get empty promises from dictators—not going to work, no matter how much John Kerry kowtows to the Communists.

We are going to restore energy dominance. They want to crush it.

We want to invest in manufacturing and other elements that will produce millions of jobs for working-class Americans. Right now, they want to rely on China to source everything we have in America.

And, of course, we want reasonable energy prices. And, as I already mentioned, Gina McCarthy and others are trying to drive up American energy costs on Americans' backs so they can go to Europe, drink a glass of wine, and tell them how well they are doing in terms of crushing our energy sector. The American people don't want that.

Our plan is what is supported by the American people, not these crazy Green New Deal policies that are hurting men and women, particularly working families and energy sector workers, more than any other policy of any administration in the history of the country.

I am glad a number of my colleagues are down here to continue this discussion. I look forward to participating with them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators CAPITO, BARRASSO, LEE, KAINE, and myself be allowed to finish our remarks before the previously scheduled rollcall votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I am pleased to be here and follow my good friend, the Senator from the great State of Alaska, a State that produces an incredible amount of energy, as does my State of North Dakota.

And, of course, we are here to talk about how this administration's policies are harming America's energy producers and leading to skyrocketing energy prices.

Americans are paying more for energy, whether it is at the gas pump or their monthly utility bills. This week, the average price of a gallon of gasoline in my home State of North Dakota is $3.19. That is up from $2.27 in January. That is an increase of almost a dollar—about a 50-percent increase. Every consumer pays that when they pull up to the pump. Of course, that hits low-income people disproportionately.

North Dakotans are also facing higher home heating costs for this winter with the price of natural gas having almost tripled. Same thing: think about hard-working men and women who now are paying that higher utility bill as a result of these policies. Higher energy prices drive up the costs of everything we consume, and lower-income Americans, as I say, are disproportionately impacted when a larger share of their paycheck must go towards covering higher energy costs.

Last week, the President blamed OPEC for higher gas prices.

Why is our country a global energy powerhouse in this situation?

Just a decade ago, North Dakotans helped crack the code on domestic energy production in the Bakken, helping the United States become the world's largest oil and gas producer. We unleashed the potential of our abundant energy reserves and, as a result, our country became a net exporter of energy in 2019.

Americans benefited from our energy independence through record low energy prices, as well as strengthen economic and national security. Energy security is national security, yet, since January, President Biden has been saying ''no'' to America's energy producers.

The President is blocking new energy leases on Federal lands, stifling the opportunity to harness our abundant taxpayer-owned energy reserves. The President also killed the Keystone XL Pipeline and is actively discouraging needed private-sector investment in new oil, gas, and coal production.

Yet this administration allowed completion of Russia's Nord Stream 2 Pipeline, which, of course, moves gas from Putin's Russia into Germany and Europe. And instead of supporting our own domestic energy workforce, the Biden administration is asking Russia, Saudi Arabia, and the OPEC nations to pump more oil.

Why on Earth are we asking foreign countries with less stringent environmental practices to produce more energy when our own domestic producers are ready and willing to answer the call?

Despite this administration's failed policy and corresponding higher energy costs, the President and Democrats are doubling down on their Green New Deal agenda.

The Democrats' reckless tax-and-spend bill will only worsen today's high energy prices by making American energy production more expensive and less reliable.

The President's policies will not only increase the pain at the pump, they are threatening the ability to keep the lights on. These climate policies will accelerate the grid's reliance on intermittent renewable sources of power at the expense of always-available baseload generation from sources like coal and nuclear power.

We need to maintain our baseload sources of electric generation that are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, regardless of weather conditions, to keep the lights on and homes warm as we enter the winter months.

And rather than turning to OPEC with less stable places in the world—our adversaries, in fact, like Russia, an adversary—we should be empowering our American energy workers to develop our abundant energy reserves here at home using the latest and greatest technologies to do it with better environmental surge. More supply of energy means lower costs for consumers. It is as simple as that.

The President needs to work with us to support our domestic energy producers and their work to provide low-cost, dependable energy to our homes and businesses.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, first, let me commend my colleague, the former Governor of North Dakota and now the senior Senator from North Dakota, for his very thoughtful comments with which I agree.

I come to the floor today, as well, to talk about energy prices, which we know are spiking all across the country. As the President is soaring off to a climate conference in Scotland, energy prices are soaring here at home.

This year alone, we have seen energy costs spiking for families all across this country. Energy prices have gone up not just a little; they have gone up a lot. The cost of filling your tank with gas is up about $1 a gallon today as compared to the day that Joe Biden was sworn into office. As a result, my constituents in Wyoming are paying about $25 to $30 more per tank every time they fill up—every time they go to the pump—than they would have done in January, when Joe Biden was sworn in.

It is not just gasoline prices that are up in our cars and trucks; it is natural gas prices that are way up—a 7-year high for gas at the pump and a 7-year high for natural gas. And all of these things are impacting people, especially as winter is coming. People use natural gas to heat their homes and cool their homes, and they use natural gas to cook.

Well, you know, it really shouldn't be this way wherein we see these skyrocketing prices because, in America, we have the largest energy resources in the world. Many of them are in my home State of Wyoming.

Under the last Presidential administration, America became the largest producer of oil and natural gas in the world, yet, in what we saw on the first day of his administration, President Biden declared war on American energy, on energy produced here at home in America.

On that very first day in office, he killed the Keystone XL Pipeline. That action immediately ended the jobs of thousands of individuals at the height of a pandemic.

President Biden didn't stop there. He went further when he shut down the exploration of oil and gas in the Arctic. He banned oil and gas leasing on Federal lands and in Federal waters. It was ruled illegal, and he did it anyway.

President Biden's radical, anti-American energy agenda is hurting our economy, and people in every State of the Union are paying the price and feeling the pain today. They are feeling it with higher energy bills. Anytime they pay an energy bill, they are paying more.

So what do the Democrats want to do about this?

Well, it is pretty obvious they want to make it worse. NANCY PELOSI and CHUCK SCHUMER are pushing a $3.5 trillion reckless tax-and-spending spree.

Last month, in the Energy Committee, of which I am the ranking member, one Commissioner of the FERC—the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission—had something to say about this $3.5 trillion spending bill. He said it would be like an ''H bomb''—an ''H bomb''—on America's electric markets. That is because the bill that the Democrats are trying to push through on a party-line vote is actually just the disastrous Green New Deal with a new name.

So what is in this bill?

Well, it would effectively kill coal, oil, and natural gas permitting on Federal lands. It would replicate California's unreliable electric grid, and it would do it on a national scale. The result would be what they have seen in California: rolling blackouts, service that is less reliable, and costs that are even higher.

The Democrats' bill would impose punishing new taxes on natural gas producers.

What happens to that?

Well, of course, these fees would be passed along to the consumers.

Where will they see it?

Well, in their energy bills.

It would create a new tax on mining firms based on how much dirt they moved. The Democrats literally, in their legislation, with 40 different taxes in it, now have a dirt tax.

The bill would waste $27 billion on a slush fund for environmental activists. Now, it is not clear exactly what all of this $27 billion would be used for—$27 billion—but we can be sure that taxpayers won't be getting their money back. Taxpayers will never see that money again.

How they actually dish out the money is completely open-ended, but what we do know is it can be used to hire environmental activists, armies of lawyers and mobs, to protest because their goal is to shut down energy and our industries and the energy economy, harming families and throwing people out of work.

Then, finally, this large bill would give huge tax breaks to rich people who want to buy electric vehicles. The Democrats' spending bill would give up to $12,500 to married couples who make as much as $800,000 a year. They would get a tax break. All they would need to do is buy a luxury electric vehicle.

The American people are already paying high energy prices. They are doing it because President Biden is blocking American energy. You know there isn't enough supply to meet the demand, and the Democrats have complained about it.

So how do they make the situation worse?

Well, they impose punishing fees; they waste billions of taxpayer dollars; they shut down the abundant and affordable energy sources that fuel our economy.

And, of course, all of these are good-paying jobs. American families can't afford the Democrats' reckless tax-and-spending spree.

So here we are today with the President's going off to Scotland. He will be there for Halloween, and people around this country will be suffering the nightmare of high energy costs. Not that long ago, we were a nation of energy wealth and energy dominance, but this President and this administration have changed it to make us a nation of energy weakness and a nation that is now dependent upon others for energy.

The American people wouldn't believe that we are, today, using more energy and more oil from Russia than we are from Alaska, but that is what this President has brought to this country—a jackpot for Vladimir Putin—and energy workers who are out of work here at home. It is a disgrace.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, today, I join my colleagues to talk about highlighting some of the things that we see in the dubious environment and energy provisions included in the Democrats' reckless tax-and-spending proposal and what that will mean to the American public.

This week, the U.S. Energy Information Administration, a nonpartisan governmental group, forecasted that the cost of Americans' natural gas bills will go up 30 percent this winter. We are getting ready to get into the cold winter season. That means American households will spend an average of $746 on gas heating in the months from October through March—30 percent more than last year.

Now, maybe to some people, $746 doesn't sound like much, but if you are on a fixed income and you have to pay that every month, that means having to make difficult decisions.

Also, with natural gas, which is the primary heating fuel for 48 percent of American homes, which is nearly half the country, this has huge implications for our families.

As I said, just think of retirees in West Virginia, who are on fixed incomes. That 30-percent increase is huge and unmanageable. People already struggle to pay their energy bills in normal times, but with this increase, difficult decisions will have to be made in many households.

Think of a family of four just trying to get through—trying to get through the school year—and they have just enough to buy the necessities for their children, and now their heating bill is 30-percent higher. That is a big hit to that family.

Americans who rely on propane will face an even greater price increase, and that is a lot of Americans. The EIA said it is expecting a 54-percent increase this winter.

So with Americans facing eye-popping increases in home heating, Congress should be considering legislation that lowers those costs by producing more energy here at home; but, instead, the House Energy and Commerce Committee reported legislation to impose a methane tax, which would really be called a natural gas tax.

This regressive provision would make already high heating costs even worse this winter and beyond, and low- and middle-income families would suffer because we know those costs always get passed on. The natural gas tax would put jobs in the energy sector in my home State at risk. This week, we saw reports that this tax may drop out of the reconciliation package. Good news for me, and it would be good news for States like ours.

But even without a natural gas tax or the devastating Clean Electricity Payment Program, which also is rumored to be on the chopping block, the remaining provisions in the Democrats' legislation wastes taxpayers' dollars and includes broad, new regulatory policies that would change this country.

For example, there is the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund. It is a $27.5 billion slush fund for Democratic States and progressive organizations to finance whatever so-called green projects they may want.

Apparently, our colleagues are concerned that the over $200 billion we have in renewable energy tax credits is not enough to encourage the private sector to finance projects. Therefore, billions of tax dollars are required to provide even more public financing for their wish list.

Two other provisions tucked into the House bill that have not received much attention could have major policy implications.

First, the House bill includes a $50 million fund to create a new greenhouse gas emissions regulation at the EPA, like President Obama's Clean Power Plan.

My question would be, if the EPA is funded, why they would need another $50 million to create a program.

But this provision directs the EPA to develop overly burdensome regulations. At the request of 26 States, the U.S. Supreme Court stayed President Obama's Clean Power Plan because the EPA lacked the statutory authority.

Yet this $50 million provision, tucked into the $3.5 trillion behemoth bill, isn't only about giving more money to the EPA; it is designed to give the administration the ability to say that future climate rules were specifically authorized by the Congress. These rules could regulate energy production, manufacturing, agriculture—really, any sector in the U.S. economy—and place countless jobs at risk.

Another separate $50 million provision directs the Federal Highway Administration to come up with a greenhouse gas emissions performance measure.

What is that?

States would then be required to set emissions reduction targets based on that performance measure. The Federal Highway Administration is also directed to impose consequences on States that fail to meet these targets.

How much of a reduction in emissions do States have to achieve to hit their targets? What actions will States have to take or not take in order to meet their targets? More importantly, what consequences will the Federal Highway Administration impose on our States that fail to meet their targets? Will they lose their Federal highway dollars? Will States have more restrictions on building new roads? Will there be new requirements to direct highway funding to other activities that reduce emissions?

All of those questions are left unanswered.

This $50 million open-ended provision, reported by the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, could jeopardize the ability of States to build new roads and bridges.

These are just a few of the erratic environmental provisions in this reckless tax-and-spending spree. Their provisions have not had the careful consideration that they need to have, and they have not had the vetting that, I think, programs such as these would need.

The package is much broader than that. It is really a lot of wasteful spending. It is regulatory overreach that will make energy and goods more expensive. We have talked on and on about the rising costs of goods and, particularly, gasoline. It is a progressive wish list rolled into a $3.5 trillion bill that inserts the government into nearly every phase of American life from cradle to grave. The reconciliation bill should not pass.

I will continue to come to the floor, along with my colleagues, to shine a light on the harmful provisions and help inform the American people about what really is in this package.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2844

Mr. LEE. Madam President, in politics, on television, on social media, and pretty much everywhere, it seems that people are decrying the surge of ''misinformation.'' False information and dangerous ideas exist, but the cure to factions of falsehood and the kinds of harms coming from them was something that was prescribed in the very early days of our Republic.

James Madison wrote in Federalist No. 10 of the value that our large Union would always possess in defeating self-interested and dangerous ideas and philosophies and specifically factions. The answer is simple: Our free society, with free exchange of ideas, allows for a multiplicity of viewpoints, perspectives, and opinions to be heard, and then the true, correct, and useful ideas tend to rise to the top.

Madison wrote:

The increased variety of parties comprised within the Union, increase . . . security.

At this point, I would add that the definition of ''parties'' here is best understood to encompass information, ideas, and opinions—all things that tend to unify people around one faction or another, one party or another, one group of people or another.

But, oh, how many have lost their way since then. Be it through mandates, censorship, cancel culture, or something else, it seems that this dialogue of ideas and information is being rejected by many segments of our society. What a shame that is. It is an even greater shame that, often, this is the result of government action.

Yesterday, I came to the Senate floor with one of my dozen bills to try to counteract President Biden's vaccine mandate. This bill that I offered up yesterday required only that the Secretary of Health and Human Services provide the information the Department already has on adverse COVID–19 vaccine effects to the public. We have already got this information. We just wanted them to share it with the public, with the American taxpayer—those who have been footing the bill all along. Regrettably, the senior Senator from Washington objected to the bill and described it as a waste of time and one that would somehow undermine trust.

My response to that is simple: Why would we ever want the Federal Government to hide any health information from Americans? If we want to build confidence in these vaccines, and we do—I certainly do—then the Federal Government must get out of its own way and build trust and confidence with concerned Americans by sharing information.

Allow me to be abundantly clear. I am very much against the vaccine mandate, but I am for the vaccine. I have been vaccinated. I have encouraged others, including my family, to be vaccinated, and they have done so. I believe these vaccines are miracles. They are helping many millions of Americans to avoid the harms of COVID–19. But there are many Americans who are deeply concerned with the vaccine. They are not going to be people who are simply convinced by cruelty or by extortion.

I have heard from over 300 Utahns who are at risk of losing their livelihoods due to this damaging, senseless, and immoral mandate. These are not our enemies. They are mothers and fathers. They are neighbors. They are military servicemembers. They are our friends. They deserve more respect than being fired, brushed aside, and permanently relegated to unemployable, outcast status, which is the inevitable consequence of this mandate. This is where it naturally leads.

Now, many of these people would appreciate more information from the COVID research that their taxpayer dollars are already paying for. One would expect that the amount of research should be pretty darn extensive considering that as of May 31, 2021, just a few months ago, Congress had supplemented the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services with approximately $484 billion in COVID–19 funds. That is a lot of money. That is almost half a trillion dollars.

Keep in mind that a trillion dollars represents, last I checked, roughly $3,000 for every man, woman, and child in America—not every taxpayer; not every worker; but every man, woman, and child in America. This is roughly half a trillion, so we are talking somewhere in the neighborhood of $1,500 for every man, woman, and child in America.

This is their money. These are their funds. This is money that they worked really hard to produce. So it should be their information that they have access to. But, lamentably, as recent news has shown, the National Institutes of Health often feels the need to hide information about its activities from the public. So, today, I have come to the Senate floor for now the 10th time on the vaccine mandate with a solution that should be entirely noncontroversial.

My bill, the Transparency in COVID–19 Research Act, would simply require that the Secretary of Health and Human Services publish all the studies and findings that the Department has supported regarding COVID–19. The bill provides for the privacy of researchers and study participants. The bill would better inform Americans about the COVID–19 vaccines. The American people deserve to have this information. After all, they have paid for it, and after all, they are now routinely being subjected to it whether they want it or not.

Again, this whole exercise should be about building trust and confidence in the COVID–19 vaccine. That is, after all, what we want. You are never going to get that through threat, intimidation, extortion. In any event, it is immoral action. That is not something we can justify. That is not the way to treat our friends, our neighbors, our servicemembers.

I am grateful to my colleagues, Senators BRAUN, LUMMIS, and TUBERVILLE, who agree and have joined me as cosponsors of the bill.

Look, if we want the American people to be comfortable with the COVID–19 vaccines, we should be more than comfortable providing the research that led to their development and their approval. If we want Americans to trust their government, we should be clear that it does not hide important health and research information from them. If we want our Republic to function properly, just like James Madison hoped for, then we need to have an open dialogue with all the information. The bill would be a positive step toward each of these ends, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

So, Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent

that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 2844 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KAINE. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, reserving the right to object, we need to leave the science to scientists and researchers. Our public health Agencies, including the CDC and NIH, already release their studies publicly, and it is important that they have control over the release of this information.

Forcing researchers to put out studies on an arbitrary timeline—this bill requires all studies to be released within 14 days from the passage of the bill—could force the release of studies before data collection is complete, before they are done analyzing and reviewing the data, before it is peer reviewed. It might force them to put out studies that were funded that came to inconclusive results that might be confusing to the public.

So I think having a bill that would force release of material based on a date when a particular bill passed rather than when the science is done and it is ready to be released could be a recipe for disinformation and distrust.

The bill seems to imagine a scenario where there is critical science being hidden away or stonewalled, and I have no reason to believe that is true. That would be a dangerous suggestion at a time when we are trying to encourage people to follow the guidance of these Agencies, and the Agencies are working around-the-clock to provide lifesaving cures and up-to-date information about how people can keep their families safe from COVID.

Based upon those reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, it is disappointing that we weren't able to take this step today to restore trust and confidence with the American people in research that they have now spent half a trillion dollars conducting.

I understand the impulse to—as my friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from Virginia, put it—to let scientists handle science. That doesn't mean, that shouldn't mean, that must never mean that we exclude the American people from the right to access the findings of their own government—a government that has used their own taxpayer dollars to the tune of half a trillion dollars just through HHS and through trillions more on other COVID–19-related efforts. We should be able to trust the American people to access that information, and when we hide it, it erodes trust and confidence in the very vaccine that President Biden is trying to force on all Americans, even at the pain of losing their jobs.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 347, Matthew G. Olsen, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Charles E. Schumer, Robert Menendez, Patrick J. Leahy, Patty Murray, Maria Cantwell, Sheldon Whitehouse, Brian Schatz, Debbie Stabenow, Catherine Cortez Masto, Christopher A. Coons, Ron Wyden, Margaret Wood Hassan, Edward J. Markey, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard J. Durbin, Tina Smith, Elizabeth Warren, Angus S. King, Jr.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Matthew G. Olsen, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Sentator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Sentator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Sentator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER, (Ms. BALDWIN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yes and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 438 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Heinrich	Peters
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	Kelly	Schumer
Burr	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cardin	Leahy	Smith
Carper	Luján	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Collins	Markey	Van Hollen
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warnock
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden
Graham	Ossoff	
Hassan	Padilla	

NAYS—44

Barrasso	Boozman	Cassidy
Blackburn	Braun	Cornyn
Blunt	Capito	Cotton
Cramer	Kennedy	Sasse
Crapo	Lankford	Scott (FL)
Daines	Lee	Scott (SC)
Ernst	Lummis	Shelby
Fischer	Marshall	Sullivan
Grassley	McConnell	Thune
Hagerty	Moran	Tillis
Hawley	Paul	Toomey
Hoeven	Portman	Tuberville
Hyde-Smith	Risch	Wicker
Inhofe	Romney	Young
Johnson	Rubio	

NOT VOTING—4

Cruz	Rounds
Feinstein	Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 44.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Matthew G. Olsen, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 263, Christopher H. Schroeder, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Attorney General.

Charles E. Schumer, Ben Ray Luján, Richard J. Durbin, Elizabeth Warren, John Hickenlooper, Jacky Rosen, Brian Schatz, Tammy Baldwin, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard Blumenthal, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Christopher A. Coons, Benjamin L. Cardin, Catherine Cortez Masto, Cory A. Booker, Raphael G. Warnock, Alex Padilla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Christopher H. Schroeder, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Attorney General, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays—41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 439 Ex.]

YEAS—55

Baldwin	Booker	Carper
Bennet	Brown	Casey
Blumenthal	Cantwell	Collins
Blunt	Cardin	Coons

Cortez Masto	Luján	Schumer
Duckworth	Manchin	Shaheen
Durbin	Markey	Sinema
Gillibrand	Menendez	Smith
Graham	Merkley	Stabenow
Grassley	Murkowski	Tester
Hassan	Murphy	Tillis
Heinrich	Murray	Van Hollen
Hickenlooper	Ossoff	Warner
Hirono	Padilla	Warnock
Kaine	Peters	Warren
Kelly	Portman	Whitehouse
King	Reed	Wyden
Klobuchar	Rosen	
Leahy	Schatz	

NAYS—41

Barrasso	Hagerty	Risch
Blackburn	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Toomey
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Paul	

NOT VOTING—4

Cruz	Rounds
Feinstein	Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 41.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Christopher H. Schroeder, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3086

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, right now, American families are worried. The White House thinks inflation is a high-class problem. I clearly imagine the price of Prada bags has gone up, but what the White House continues to miss is that inflation is killing the buying power of Americans on low and fixed incomes.

Across America, families are going through grocery store aisles, seeing higher prices, and having to figure out what they can afford to eat this week. Folks are passing by gas station after gas station, looking for lower prices—to no avail. These aren't just headlines and stories; these are real families who are living paycheck to paycheck and struggling to keep up.

I grew up poor. When my parents' bills went up, it made it more difficult for my family. When gas prices went up, it meant we had less food to put on the table. None of us would wish that on anyone, but that is exactly what is happening in Biden's America—high prices on food, high prices on gas, empty shelves and supply shortages, skyrocketing debt, and Big Government overreach—and that is just the start. Energy prices are through the roof.

Let's take a look at the rising cost at the pump.

Just this week, the South Florida Sun-Sentinel ran a story with the headline: ''Gas prices hit their highest levels since 2014. When will we get a break?'' As gas prices keep rising, the message from Florida couldn't be more clear.

Last week, the national gas average was $3.36 a gallon. It was $2.16 per gallon this time last year. That is a 55-percent increase in just 1 year. If you are driving a car, that means you are seeing an extra cost of about $800 annually. If you are driving a truck, that means you are probably seeing an extra cost of $1,400 annually.

More than 5,000 gas stations across the country are charging more than $4.50 a gallon. In one California community, gas was nearly $8 per gallon last week. That is insane. Prices may go up even more as forecasters warn that oil could rise to more than $100 a barrel.

But rising costs don't stop at the pump; they follow you home. For the nearly half of U.S. families who use natural gas to heat their homes, it is going to cost them $746 just to stay warm during the winter months. If you are using electric heat, prepare to spend more than $1,200 on your electric bills. Reports show that, this winter, home heating prices are going to rise by more than 40 percent for homes that use heating oil, more than 30 percent for homes using natural gas, and 54 percent for homes using propane. Factor in the rising cost of meat, diapers, milk, and other everyday items, and things are looking pretty dire for the American family.

Last week, President Biden said he ''doesn't have a near-term answer'' for reducing gas prices. He doesn't appear to have a long-term answer either. In the meantime, he expects families to just hang tight while he does nothing until next year, when things will magically get better.

We all know President Biden likes to play the blame game. This time, he is blaming OPEC for not pumping out more foreign oil. Remember when America was energy independent? Not anymore, thanks to Joe Biden. He has done everything in his power to cut off America's domestic supply and resources needed to warm our homes and run our cars.

In his first month in office, he cut the Keystone Pipeline permit and killed thousands of American jobs. Then he suspended new oil and gas leasing and drilling permits for Federal lands.

He filled his administration with people who have been longtime advocates of a carbon tax, including Treasury Secretary Yellen, which would only make the current problem worse. He has others, like Interior Secretary Haaland, who want to completely ban fracking.

Oddly enough, he supported Russia's getting the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline, which gives Russia a massive win, and he has put us back into the Paris climate accords, which are already ruining Europe. European countries are scaling back on oil and gas production to meet the Paris Agreement. In Portugal, electricity prices have tripled over the past 6 months, and Germany's prices are three times the U.S. average. Across Europe, they have to rely on energy imports from Russia.

Instead of pursuing a path of energy independence, Biden continues to push ridiculous energy policies in his massive $5.5 trillion spending package that will cut our legs out from under us and cause America to become even more dependent on Russia and the OPEC countries, and he is relentlessly pursuing a reckless tax-and-spending spree even though we know reckless spending causes inflation.

These effects might not be felt by President Biden, but I can tell you that, since Biden took office, more families across the State of Florida and across the Nation have felt the pain of having to count their pennies.

For the sake of American families, we need to figure out what the heck is going on. This is why I have introduced a very simple bill to get to the bottom of these sky-high prices. I am thankful for Senators MARSHALL, LUMMIS, CAPITO, JOHNSON, MORAN, and BLACKBURN, who have cosponsored this legislation.

The GAS Price Act will simply require the Energy Information Administration to report publicly to Congress on any Federal Agency policies or regulations that it determines will cause energy prices to rise. All my bill does is ask a Federal Agency to provide important information to us in Congress with a statement of facts on what is causing rising energy prices since President Biden was sworn into office. Then we can take this information, see what needs to be fixed, and help the American people. That is it. Let's tell Americans why this is happening, and let's figure out how to fix it. It is as simple as that.

I am sure none of my colleagues would disagree to keeping Congress informed about new rules or policies that have a negative financial impact on families in our great State.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3086, which is at the desk. Further, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I rise to object to the Senator from Florida's request to pass this legislation through unanimous consent.

If we want to tackle rising fuel costs, let's do something that will actually protect American consumers and actually promote our energy independence. Let's reinstate the fossil fuel ban that was lifted in 2015.

Listen to what has happened here in our Nation since 2015, when every Republican on this Senate floor—when they controlled the Senate—voted to lift the ban on the exportation of oil from the United States. That ban had been in place for 50 years to keep American oil here.

Well, here's what the Republicans did in the House and Senate back in 2015: they lifted the ban.

Oil companies from the United States now send our oil overseas. And get this: In 2020, we exported more than 8.5 million barrels of petroleum every single day out of the United States to other countries. And, in 2020, pursuant to Republican Senators in 2015, we, in 2020, for the first time in more than 50 years, exported more barrels of petroleum every single day—exported—than imported.

Is that energy independence?

I don't think so.

And why do we do it?

I will tell you why we do it. It is for the oil companies. That is why we do it.

The Republicans don't want to do anything on climate change—oil companies. The oil companies want to export American oil, drill for it here in the United States, because they can make more money selling that oil into the international marketplace. Of course, that is what the Republicans are going to vote for back in 2015.

And here's what happened: we got up to 2021, and we now are net exporters of petroleum in our country.

So the bill that is being proposed would actually do nothing to help consumers at the pump. The one thing that we could do is reimpose the ban on the exportation of these 8.5 million barrels of oil a day. Keep it here. It is lower priced. It is drilled for in the United States. Our economy would get the benefit of that lower priced oil and people would be going up to the pump, paying a lot less per gallon of gasoline than they are doing right now.

But you are not going to hear anything from the Republican Party that takes on the oil industry and their international market using American oil to make more money because people in the rest of the world will pay more for it. But that leaves less American oil here for drivers, as they are pulling in to the pump every single day.

So this is just the greed of the domestic oil industry so that they can have unlimited international energy markets so that, ultimately—and this is the beauty of it—they make more money overseas and they get to tip American consumers upside down at the pumps as they have got their fingers on this nozzle and watching this price of gasoline go up even as they are looking at it. It is a beautiful world for the oil industry to have the cooperation of the Republican Party on this agenda.

And so all I can say is that this proposal is just the opposite of what we should be talking about. The Republicans should be reexamining their own conscience about what they did in 2015, instead of shedding crocodile tears today as though Joe Biden did this. This net export of petroleum products is a Republican idea driven by the Republicans who sit here on the Senate floor.

And so in no way should this resolution pass, and so I object to the Senator's motion for unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. That would be interesting if it was true. When you think about it—and you can look at oil prices, and they are international oil prices—it is illogical to believe that the American oil companies want to spend the transportation dollars to send the oil overseas if they could sell it in America.

So, first off, I am truly shocked that my colleague would say those things. I am shocked that he would object, but I get it. I know my Democratic colleagues have to bend over backwards to protect the Biden administration's disastrous energy policies. But I find it hard to believe they would go so far as to object to having basic transparency. Maybe, if what my colleague said was true, then my bill would show—they would come back and say: Yup, that is exactly what happened.

My bill would simply provide us with greater insight into the cause of rising gas and energy prices in the United States.

We must be committed to making the American dream work for everyone, ensuring that every family, including poor families, have a chance to get ahead.

I think about my mom and dad. I watched them struggle to make ends meet. This inflation, these gas prices, food prices, all these things, are hurting the poorest families in this country. When you get very little, like we did, and prices go up—gas prices, food prices—it means it is a very difficult time for these families. Hard-working families are trying to get by.

We need to provide more information to Congress so we can make good decisions to figure out why these gas prices are going up the way they are.

So I am disappointed that my colleague would object to a simple way of trying to figure out exactly what has happened here, why gas prices are going up, and what should Congress be doing to make sure that doesn't continue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

SENTENCING DISPARITY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to speak on another topic that, sadly, is still relevant today as it has been for so many years. And I want to start by recalling 35 years ago, when I was a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, I was faced with one of the most troubling votes in my whole career.

It was the height of the war on drugs. A new narcotic showed up. It was called crack cocaine. We didn't know much about it, but we knew several things: First, highly addictive; second, dirt cheap; third, if a woman who was pregnant used it, she could cause permanent harm to the baby she was carrying.

We started worrying that this was going to become the drug of choice across America and that the war on drugs was going to be lost forever.

And just about the time we were debating this, an event took place that really had no direct connection to crack cocaine, but it rocked the Capitol.

There was a basketball player at the University of Maryland, whose name was Len Bias. He was a very good basketball player, destined for the NBA. Sadly, he overdosed and died. It shocked everyone all across this region, and it certainly was felt in the House of Representatives. And, perhaps, it was part of the impetus for a measure that we enacted, which I later came to really regret.

Congress took action in 1986. I joined 400 of my House colleagues. We decided to take a stand—a really powerful stand—against crack cocaine. We decided to create a sentencing regime for crack cocaine that would be so overwhelming that anyone across America who considered using it would think twice. We went to an extreme. We decided to impose a 100-to-1 disparity between crack cocaine and powdered cocaine.

What does that mean?

If you are arrested with 5 grams of crack, you were subject to the same mandatory sentencing as someone arrested with 500 grams of powder cocaine, a 100-to-1 sentencing disparity. Our logic was there. If people knew that that kind of penalty awaits, they will surely stay away from this deadly new narcotic.

It turned out we were completely wrong. The net result of our 100-to-1 disparity against crack cocaine didn't drive the cost of the drug up on the street. It drove it down. It didn't lessen the number of people who were addicted. It increased the number of who were addicted—exactly the opposite of what we expected to happen.

And then for a decade, maybe two decades, we reaped the whirlwind. The 100-to-1 disparity meant that we were filling our prisons to a level we had never seen in the history of the United States, and, frankly, a level the world had never seen in terms of prison population. Sadly, the vast majority of them were African Americans. We stole away one or two generations of African-American males—and some females, too—in the process of making this terrible mistake.

It didn't make America any safer at all. In fact, it worsened the racial inequities in our justice system. Black Americans and White Americans use drugs at the same rates. Yet Black Americans are six times more likely to be imprisoned for drugs.

Fortunately, lawmakers on both sides of the aisle recognized this was a true injustice. I tried to undo some of the damage done by this war on drugs. We came together in 2010, on a bipartisan basis, to pass a bill I called the Fair Sentencing Act. It lowered the Federal drug sentences for the first time since the war on drugs.

Through bipartisan negotiations, we were able to significantly reduce the crack-powder sentencing disparity, but we didn't eliminate it. We reduced it from 100-to-1 to 18-to-1.

You say: How did you come up with the number of 18?

Two opposing Senators—one, myself; and the other, Jeff Sessions of Alabama, negotiated it literally in the Senate gym. We came to this agreement. We will make it 18-to-1 instead of 100-to-1. It is still dramatically higher than it should have been, but it was also dramatic progress.

Now, more than a decade later, we can finish the job with the EQUAL Act, a measure I introduced this year under the leadership of my friend and colleague, Senator CORY BOOKER. Once again, we have been able to come together on a bipartisan basis, only this time we agreed we needed to finish the job and end this disparity.

We have help on the Republican side—how about that, a bipartisan approach—with Senators PORTMAN, PAUL, TILLIS, and GRAHAM joining us.

Our House colleagues overwhelmingly agreed on a bipartisan basis themselves to change this once and for all, to go back to one-to-one in terms of sentencing on crack and powder cocaine. The legislation passed 361 to 66 in the House. Not bad, certainly in this divided political atmosphere.

It is amazing. By passing the EQUAL Act, the Members of the Senate can prove that we can learn from our mistakes.

Addiction, we have come to learn, is not a moral failing. It is a disease—a treatable disease. And if our Nation's laws encourage people to seek treatment instead of incarcerating them for seeking self-medication, we can potentially save tens of thousands of lives every year.

If I had said to the people back in Illinois 10 or 15 years ago, I went to them and said, ''Did you hear somebody downtown last night died of a drug overdose?'' 15 years ago, you would have said, ''Oh, that is a darn shame.''

And if I said, ''Try to describe to me what you think that person looked like, who that person was,'' they would have said, ''My guess is it is an African American, probably a male. He is probably between 20 and 35 years of age.''

And you would have been right 15 years ago.

But now we are seeing overdoses, particularly with opioids and fentanyl, that really belie that image, that stereotype of the drug addict. We are finding drug addiction to opioids reaching every corner of society—Black, White and Brown, young and old, people who have a lot of money, and people who are dirt poor.

And so we started looking at addiction differently. It isn't a problem with the minorities. It is a problem with America that we have to cope with. And we need to deal with it honestly, not with stiff criminal penalties so much as treatment that can deal with these addictions, and that is critically important.

The war on drugs took its toll on America. It directly fueled the crisis of mass incarceration, and we wasted—wasted—billions of Federal dollars in the process, dollars that could have been spent on actually making America safe.

We need to replace criminalization with commonsense and compassion. We can start by passing the EQUAL Act.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. President, on a separate topic, as we round out the week, we continue to vote on a number of very important executive and judicial nominations.

I want to start by speaking quickly about four critical positions in the Justice Department: Matt Olsen, to head the DOJ National Security Division; Chris Schroeder, nominated to head the Office of Legal Counsel; Hampton Dellinger, Office of Legal Counsel; Elizabeth Prelogar, to serve as the Nation's next Solicitor General.

All of them are eminently qualified, have deep experience and strong credentials, and they understand the importance of DOJ independence. Let me say a few words about them.

Matt Olsen has dedicated the bulk of his career to helping keep our Nation safe, and he will continue do that same thing as Assistant Attorney General for National Security. From his time at the Justice Department to his work at the National Security Agency, to his tenure as the confirmed Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, he has been a leader when it comes to security in America.

Chris Schroeder, nominated to head the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel—or OLC—has significant experience, including serving as counselor to the Assistant Attorney General and as Deputy Assistant himself. He has a deep understanding of the office and is ready to provide the kind of skill and experience we need.

Hampton Dellinger, nominated to serve as Assistant AG for the Office of Legal Policy, has bipartisan support in our committee and has decades of public and private service. He oversaw the judicial vetting process for State judges in North Carolina. I am confident he will enable the Department of Justice to continue its track record of processing President Biden's highly qualified nominees.

Elizabeth Prelogar, nominated to be the U.S. Solicitor General, is an accomplished appellate advocate. She argued nine cases before the Supreme Court and filed hundreds of amicus briefs and other petitions. She knows this job, and she knows it well, and it is time that she is given this opportunity to serve.

Let me conclude by saying that these nominees are the kind of experienced people we need. We have good nominees for the court as well.

The Senate will also be voting soon on two highly qualified nominees for the Federal judiciary: Omar Williams for the District of Connecticut and Beth Robinson for the Second Circuit.

These nominees have received strong support from their home State senators. They both currently serve as State court judges, and both have been rated ''well qualified'' by the American Bar Association. Their records show that they have an even-handed approach to administering justice and that they are guided by one principle above all else: fidelity to the rule of law.

Judge Omar Williams, nominated to the District of Connecticut, is an accomplished State court judge and former public defender who has earned wide acclaim from the Connecticut legal community.

In recognition of his work on the State bench, Judge Williams was appointed to several important judicial bodies by the Connecticut Supreme Court, including the New England Regional Judicial Opioid Initiative. He also received bipartisan support in the Judiciary Committee.

As I mentioned, we will also be voting on Vermont Supreme Court Justice Beth Robinson, nominated to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals. Justice Robinson is an experienced litigator with a proven track record of impartial, even-handed judicial decisionmaking.

She attended Dartmouth College and the University of Chicago Law School. After graduating, she clerked for Judge David Sentelle—a President Reagan appointee—on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit.

In private practice, Justice Robinson specialized in civil litigation. She also developed a large practice representing LGBTQ clients in civil rights and family law issues.

Justice Robinson was a proponent of LGBTQ rights at a time when most were not. She championed same-sex couples' freedom to marry and participate in, as Justice Kennedy said in Obergefell, the ''highest ideals of love, fidelity, devotion, sacrifice, and family.''

As an advocate, she always understood and respected the important intersection between LGBTQ rights and religious liberty. She worked with Vermont State representatives on a marriage equality bill to ''affirm[] what the Constitution required-that no clergy would be forced to perform a same-sex marriage against their will.''

Since her appointment to the bench, Justice Robinson has proven that she respects the difference between being an advocate and a judge. Over the last 10 years, she has participated in nearly 1,800 decisions. And she has done so without a hint of bias.

One of her former colleagues on the Vermont Supreme Court wrote to the committee to emphasize that Justice Robinson was a ''fair, unbiased'' jurist. So it certainly came as a surprise when some of our colleagues on the other side suggested that Justice Robinson opposes religious liberty.

Let me be clear: This is a baseless claim. And it is a claim that was made by distorting Justice Robinson's record. So let's set the record straight.

In private practice, she represented a Catholic woman who believed that she had been discriminated against because of her religious views. Remarkably, committee Republicans offered this as proof of Justice Robinson's hostility toward religious liberty.

In private practice, Justice Robinson was also instrumental in ensuring that a Vermont marriage equality bill included protections desired by religious leaders, such as a provision specifying that clergy would never be ''forced to perform a same-sex marriage against their will.''

In 2003, she stated: ''I've always said that if somebody tried to force the Catholic Church to do a gay wedding, I would represent the Church pro bono.''

So these claims that she is biased have no basis in reality.

Justice Robinson is an outstanding nominee with impeccable credentials. She has a proven even-handed approach to justice. And she would be the first openly LGBTQ woman to serve on a circuit court.

I look forward to supporting both Judge Williams and Justice Robinson, and I urge my colleagues to join me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

EQUAL ACT

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I first want to say before my colleague leaves—I know he has a packed day—when I came to the U.S. Senate, I found a friend, I found a mentor, and I found a leader on issues of justice. The incredible friend I have in the Senator from Illinois—he has been leading on issues from immigration reform and fighting for Dreamers all the way to being the principal leader on the Democratic side for the passage of the First Step Act.

I will never forget that he invited me to the White House in my earliest days with then-President Obama, centering me on that table. I had just gotten here, and he then was talking about these issues—the issues of mass incarceration, the issues of racial discrimination and incarceration. What I rise to talk about really is an issue that my colleague has been dealing with for 35 years. He gave important history.

It was a bipartisan issue 35 years ago when the Senate and House of Representatives voted to pass the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986, and the President signed it into law that year. He said, very specifically, one of the things it did was create a massive sentencing disparity between crack and powder cocaine. The bill made it so that five grams of crack cocaine—the example that my colleague gave—carried the same mandatory minimum prison sentence as 500 grams of powder cocaine. That is a 100-to-1 disparity.

What is very powerful to me is what Maya Angelou said. She said:

> Do the best you can until you know better. Then when you know better, do better.

And that is the leadership of Senator DICK DURBIN. Understanding that this was a failure, that the policy did not achieve its intended purpose—in fact, it created, as he described, the opposite—DICK DURBIN then led this body towards the long process of making reforms happen.

I was proud that when I got into the Senate, Senator DURBIN told me the story of how we got it from 100 to 1 down to 18 to 1. It wasn't necessarily based on science. It wasn't necessarily based on law enforcement evidence. It was a negotiation between Senator DURBIN and another Republican colleague. I love the story because Senator DURBIN pushed for what we are asking for right now. He then fought for 1 to 1. He couldn't get it but was able to negotiate down from 100 to 1 to 18 to 1.

So what I would like to do is read real quickly the research that looked at cocaine use in the United States from right before this bill was first passed up until 2013. I want to quote:

> Despite harsher ADAA penalties for crack compared to powder cocaine, there was no decrease in crack use following implementation of sentencing policies . . . although both powder cocaine use and misuse of prescription drugs (the negative control) decreased.

The report concluded that ''these findings suggest that mandatory minimum sentencing may not be an effective method of deterring cocaine use.''

This has been the growing consensus about the War on Drugs on both sides of the aisle. It has been one that has been changing policy.

I am so grateful for Senator DURBIN's work chipping away at the mistakes that were made.

During the time between when I was in law school in the 1990s and mayor of the largest city in my State in 2006, we saw the prison population explode in this country. In that period, we were building a new prison or jail—about 1 every 10 days. We became the place on the planet Earth with the most incarcerated people. One-third of all the women incarcerated on planet Earth are now in the United States of America; one out of every four incarcerated people, period—in the United States of America.

A growing consensus of bipartisan work led by Senator DURBIN with his wingman from Jersey has been beginning to undermine that, with our partners. So we saw the 2018 passage of the First Step Act, a bill which was made retroactive, and we saw thousands of people liberated from Federal prison who were unjustly sentenced under that 1986 law. The bill Senator DURBIN and I wrote and introduced, the EQUAL Act—this is again Senator DURBIN's leadership—is now our opportunity to do better.

It must feel good for everyone who understands the good intentions but disastrous results of the crack cocaine-powder cocaine disparity. For all those who understand that we say equal justice under law, but the disproportionate impact it had on Black and Brown communities, further punishing African-American communities in a disproportionate way—in fact, incarcerated Black men at rates that we now have more Black men under criminal supervision in America than all the slaves in 1850. So we are working to do better.

The bill that I picked up to partner with Senator DURBIN on passed the House of Representatives. And Senator DURBIN hinted at this—I would have never expected it—it passed with overwhelming bipartisan support. The bill was championed by Democrats and Republicans. It passed with 149 Republicans voting for it, and now it is over here. The great thing is, our list of cosponsors, which Senator DURBIN read, is growing. I think we will have an announcement over the next few days of other Republicans joining this bill.

We can't change the past, but we can make for a better future. We can't undo the disparities that have disproportionately sent African Americans to prison, but we can make for a more equal and more just future.

There is an old saying that ''the arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends towards justice.'' It was a Martin Luther King quote. But he also said that ''change does not roll in on the wheels of inevitability.'' It must be carried in on the backs of people who are willing to struggle for it, people who still believe that this Nation can be a symbol to this world about justice and its justice system.

A terrible mistake was made 35 years ago. I was a teenager. There are people right now unjustly incarcerated—an affront to our most sacred ideal in this country, that of liberty. They are there because of this mistake. We have not fixed it. It was grievous. We have not fixed it. It is wrong. This is our moment. It is a moment of redemption to right past wrongs, to set this Nation on a more just course, to bend the arc of the moral universe more towards justice.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. I urge them to be arc benders. Together, we can make this a more perfect Union.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

OVER-THE-COUNTER HEARING AIDS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I hear from Iowans all the time about the high cost of hearing aids. The $5,000 or $6,000 or even $10,000 costs are often shocking for seniors who are on fixed incomes.

Thirty-eight million Americans, and, obviously, most of the time adults, have hearing loss. Hearing loss makes it harder to work, harder to socialize, and then easier to become isolated.

In 2016, I began a bipartisan effort with Democratic Senator WARREN of Massachusetts to allow consumers to purchase over-the-counter hearing aids. If you can buy nonprescription reading glasses over the counter, it makes very good sense that you should be able to buy basic, safe hearing aids as well.

When Senator WARREN and I began our efforts, our goal was simple: By making more products more easily available to consumers, this competition will increase and then lead to lower costs.

Despite every special interest, we passed in 2017 a bill that is entitled the ''Over-the-Counter Hearing Aid Act.'' Last week, the FDA, just now, released proposed regulations for over-the-counter hearing aids. This is very welcomed news, but it took the FDA bureaucracy more than 3 years to draft regulations.

Senator WARREN and I pressed both the Trump administration and now the Biden administration to take action, get these regulations out so we can get these over-the-counter hearing aids on the market. I am glad that the FDA finally did its job.

Now the same Iowans who told me about the high cost of hearing aids can comment on the draft regulations. So everybody who wants to make such comments has until January 18 of next year to make comments on the draft regulations.

As long as the FDA bureaucracy acts—and I hope they will be listening—I expect Iowans can purchase over-the-counter hearing aids sometime in early 2022.

This is good news for Iowans and for Americans, generally.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise to discuss where things stand after 9 months under President Biden.

To start, American citizens are still left behind enemy lines in Afghanistan, even though the President said in August that he would get every single American home safe before pulling out our troops.

And the numbers are much worse than the administration has led us to believe. As of this week, the State Department is in touch with more than 400 Americans who are still in Afghanistan. About half of those—at least 196 American citizens—want to leave, but they have been unable to do so.

Leaving even one American citizen who wants to come home at the mercy of the Taliban is a failure in leadership. It should never have been an option. But it has been 2 months, and there are still 196 Americans in Afghanistan who want out. That is unconscionable.

President Biden should have done what was needed to bring every last American home, like he promised he would do in August. That is his No. 1 responsibility as President, to ensure the safety of the American people.

But maybe we shouldn't be surprised, since he hasn't been able to secure our own border. In fact, he doesn't even try to secure our southern border.

Customs and Border Protection reported recently that they apprehended more than 1.7 million migrants attempting to cross our southern border illegally over the span of just 12 months. That is the highest total ever recorded in a single fiscal year. And if border agents encountered 1.7 illegal migrants, imagine how many were able to cross into our country undetected.

CBP encountered nearly 200,000 illegal migrants last month alone, meaning that apprehensions were up by more than 230 percent in September 2021 compared to September of 2020.

If you want to know why we have this crisis at the border, ask the migrants themselves. Many have been very honest about why they risk their lives to travel thousands of miles to the United States. If you ask them why—ask them why they are here—their answer is simple: The President promised to let us in.

We are a nation of immigrants, but we cannot have effective legal immigration if illegal immigration is spiraling out of control.

Illegal immigration means cutting in front of millions of people who have been waiting years to come to the United States the right way. Our message as a nation needs to be that if you want to come here, you have to follow our laws. You cannot just walk across the border.

President Obama said it well a few weeks ago in an interview on ABC News. He said:

> And we see tragedy and hardship and families that are desperately trying to get here so that their kids are safe, and they're in some cases fleeing violence or catastrophe. At the same time, we're a nation state. We have borders. The idea that we can just have open borders is something that . . . as a practical matter, is unsustainable.

Well, ABC cut that portion of the interview out. I suppose they can't allow a former President of the United States to disagree with the radical left-wing of their party.

This is all taking place against the backdrop of the highest inflation rate in decades and massive supply chain issues that threaten to cripple our recovering economy. The White House insists these problems are only going to affect the upper class—they are high-class problems. Press Secretary Jen Psaki said the other day that our supply chain issues are nothing more than ''the tragedy of the treadmill that's delayed.'' What an out-of-touch thing to say. She must be talking about her friends and neighbors here in DC because I don't know many Nebraskans who are spending thousands of dollars on in-home treadmills.

Rising costs and shortages are hurting everyone—most of all, the tens of millions of Americans who are living paycheck to paycheck. The President's shameless ''buy now, pay later'' policies are forcing hard-working Americans to pay an extra dollar for a gallon of gas while they watch the real value of their retirement accounts slump.

They might not live in Washington or New York or San Francisco, but these are real people. They are small business owners who are wondering if they will be able to get the supplies that they need to meet historic demand this holiday season. They are millions of hard-working Americans who rely on propane to heat their homes who are worried about getting priced out of a warm house this winter. They are families who don't know if they will be able to put food on the table for their kids.

Anyone who thinks most people's first concern is whether the newest Peloton is going to arrive on time, they have no idea what working Americans do to get by every single day.

What has the response to these unprecedented problems been in the media? The Washington Post said it is ''time for some new, more realistic expectations.'' I think people will find that ''lower your expectations'' is not a very optimistic and it is not a very inspiring slogan for the party in power.

And as dangerous as this wave of inflation is, it is really not like nobody saw it coming. Larry Summers, the liberal economist who directed the National Economic Council under President Obama, has been sounding the alarm for months. He is not the only one. Dozens of leading experts have warned against borrowing trillions of dollars to expand the reach of government when inflation is already running rampant.

But, earlier this year, Democrats in Congress spent nearly $2 trillion on an entirely partisan basis under the pretense that it was necessary to fight the pandemic. So what is the fix? What is the fix? How is President Biden going to pull America back from the brink of stagflation?

Well, he wants to spend even more of the American people's hard-earned money. The President said in August that the massive, multitrillion-dollar spending spree he wants this Chamber to approve ''won't increase inflation. It will take the pressure off of inflation.''

Well, he leaves how that might happen to our imagination. In reality, trying to spend our way out of inflation is like trying to put a fire out with lighter fluid; it is absolutely delusional.

We cannot just keep spending more and more, not when, as the senior Senator from West Virginia said recently, ''[m]illions of jobs are open, supply chains are strained, and unavoidable inflation taxes are draining workers' hard-earned wages as the price of gasoline and groceries continues to climb.''

Out-of-control spending is how we got here in the first place, and the longer we keep at it, the worse it is going to get. Some Democrats are fond of saying that this bill will cost zero dollars because, well, it might be paid for through new taxes. The truth is that their plan would create trillions of dollars in new entitlements, and even if they do find a way to pay for it, which I doubt, that doesn't mean it is free. That money has to come from somewhere, and the Joint Committee on Taxation has shown that two-thirds of Democrats' proposed new tax burdens—they would fall on the lower and the middle class of this country.

I wish I could say the outrageous pricetag is the only thing wrong with the Democrats' tax-and-spend boondoggle, but what is actually in their plan might even be more irresponsible. It would allow the IRS to snoop on Americans' bank accounts if their inflows and their outflows exceed $10,000 per year.

Now, that is a lot of money, but let's put it in perspective. Federal agents would get to see your house and car payments, how much you spend on groceries and gas, heating bills, school costs for your kids, and everything else that you spend in a year just to get by. So spending over $10,000 a year on these essentials that are in our lives, they would let the IRS be in just about every American's bank account.

Democrats' plan would also expand green energy tax credits for wealthy Americans so they can buy expensive electric vehicles they can already afford. A millionaire can buy the most expensive new Tesla for $150,000, and under what the senior Senator from Oregon has proposed, they will be able to claim a tax credit worth $12,500. Nebraska taxpayers don't need to be subsidizing new electric cars for rich Americans.

And maybe worst of all, the House plan does not include the Hyde amendment, which Republicans and Democrats have agreed on for decades. If the radical left succeeds in taking that out, taxpayers will be required to pay for abortions for the first time in more than 40 years.

The American people have been watching this country bounce from crisis to crisis to crisis, and after so many disasters in a row, one poll shows that President Biden's approval rating is down to just 37 percent. Barely a third of Americans approve of the job this President is doing, and a majority say this administration is not competent.

That should tell President Biden that his agenda isn't as popular in the rest of America as it is in the beltway bubble. But, instead, the President is forging ahead with more Federal Government controls.

There is now even talk of a Federal vaccine mandate. The government is going to twist an obscure labor law beyond recognition to force Americans to take that vaccine.

I believe in the vaccines. I believe they are safe and effective and we should be encouraging people to choose to get vaccinated, but the government—the government—simply has no business requiring Americans to do it. Under the President's new Executive order, businesses with more than 100 employees are being forced to comply with the vaccine mandate or submit employees to weekly testing; otherwise, they will risk losing crucial employees.

I recently signed on to a letter led by the junior Senator from Alaska that urges the President to reconsider. There is absolutely no precedent in American history for a Federal vaccine requirement, and President Biden will be on entirely new legal ground if he moves ahead with this.

One of the most unsettling things I have seen from this administration wasn't something that they said or did; it was something that they left unsaid. When Jen Psaki broke the news that the Federal Government was going to try to force through this mandate, she smiled. In response to a reporter who asked if the President had the power to enforce vaccination for private employees—not Federal contractors, private employees—she said, ''Yes. Stay tuned.'' And then she grinned.

Without saying anything, she showed that the Biden administration is relishing this chance to push the limits of Executive power. When you take that together with the incompetence that has been on display since January, from the Afghanistan debacle to the crisis at our southern border, to our administration's complete disregard for how inflation is devastating hard-working families and the poor in our country, I think you start to get a good idea of what the Biden administration is all about.

They are going to trample on the Constitution to advance a radical left agenda that is truly unprecedented in American history, and they don't care how many disasters they continue to create.

Thank you.

Madam President, I would ask consent that the 5:15 vote occur immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 368, Hampton Y. Dellinger, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Charles E. Schumer, Ben Ray Luján, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher A. Coons, Elizabeth Warren, John Hickenlooper, Jacky Rosen, Brian Schatz, Tammy Baldwin, Patrick J. Leahy, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Richard Blumenthal, Benjamin L. Cardin, Catherine Cortez Masto, Cory A. Booker, Raphael Warnock, Alex Padilla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Hampton Y. Dellinger, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Attorney General, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, and nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 440 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin	Heinrich	Padilla
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Kaine	Rosen
Brown	Kelly	Sanders
Cantwell	King	Schatz
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Luján	Sinema
Collins	Manchin	Smith
Coons	Markey	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Tester
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murkowski	Warnock
Gillibrand	Murphy	Warren
Graham	Murray	Whitehouse
Hassan	Ossoff	Wyden

NAYS—45

Barrasso	Grassley	Portman
Blackburn	Hagerty	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Tuberville
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Paul	Young

NOT VOTING—4

Cruz	Rounds
Feinstein	Warner

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51 and the nays are 45.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Hampton Y.

Dellinger, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 413, Elizabeth Prelogar, of Idaho, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Sheldon Whitehouse, Ben Ray Luján, Martin Heinrich, Cory A. Booker, Jack Reed, Richard J. Durbin, Mazie K. Hirono, Christopher A. Coons, Richard Blumenthal, Jacky Rosen, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Gary C. Peters, Chris Van Hollen, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Michael F. Bennet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Elizabeth Prelogar, of Idaho, to be Solicitor General of the United States, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 441 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Risch
Blumenthal	Kaine	Rosen
Booker	Kelly	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Luján	Sinema
Casey	Manchin	Smith
Collins	Markey	Stabenow
Coons	Menendez	Tester
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Tillis
Crapo	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Graham	Padilla	Wyden
Heinrich	Peters	

NAYS—42

Barrasso	Cramer	Hyde-Smith
Blackburn	Daines	Inhofe
Blunt	Ernst	Johnson
Boozman	Fischer	Kennedy
Braun	Grassley	Lankford
Burr	Hagerty	Lee
Cassidy	Hassan	Lummis
Cornyn	Hawley	Marshall
Cotton	Hoeven	McConnell
Moran	Sasse	Thune
Paul	Scott (FL)	Toomey
Portman	Scott (SC)	Tuberville
Romney	Shelby	Wicker
Rubio	Sullivan	Young

NOT VOTING—5

Capito	Feinstein	Warner
Cruz	Rounds	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). The yeas are 53, the nays are 42.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Elizabeth Prelogar, of Idaho, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent, but had I been present would have voted yes on rollcall vote No. 433, on the confirmation of Karen McGlashen Williams, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.

I was necessarily absent, but had I been present would have voted yes on rollcall vote No. 434, on the confirmation of Patricia Tolliver Giles, of Virginia, to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia.

TRIBUTE TO THE OAK RIDGE 85, THE CLINTON 12, AND REVEREND PAUL TURNER

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, it is my privilege to honor an esteemed group of Americans for their courageous stand against the horrors of segregation.

It has been said that those about to make history can't possibly comprehend the impact their actions will have on the world; but I think that in this case, the opposite was true. The heroes I honor today weren't fighting to cross a threshold, but for something far more fundamental: the dignity and freedom granted by our Lord God to all men, women, and children. It was a moment of hope and profound consequence that rippled across the country and embraced the potential of future generations.

On behalf of the entire Tennessee congressional delegation, I would like to thank the following Tennesseans for their tremendous contribution to the fight against hatred:

Jo Ann Crozier Allen Boyce,
Bobby Cain,
Anna Theresser Caswell,
Ronald Gordon ''Poochie'' Hayden,
Minnie Ann Dickie Jones,
William R. Latham,
Alvah Jay McSwain,
Regina Turner Smith,
Maurice Soles,
Robert Thacker,
Gail Ann Epps Upton, and
Alfred Williams, who comprise the ''Clinton 12'';
Dr. Ahmed Alhamisi (Lawrence Graham),
Rufus Graham,
L.C. Gipson,
Emma McCaskill,
Ernestine Avery,
Margaret Strickland Guinn,
Eugene Hawkins,
Mary Mahone Bohanon,
Ethel Davidson Sykes,
Monroe Jones,
Leroy Justice,
Maxine Officer,
Alma McKinney Stevens,
Archie Lee,
Dorothy Kirk Lewis,
Eloise Mitchell,
Edward Lewis Threat,
Charles Walker,
Shirley Hawkins Lawrence,
Barbara Jean Sims Thomas,
Jessie McClanahan,
Webster Jackson,
John D. Ghosten, Jr.,
Evindies Copeland,
Mattie L. Scales, and
Joe West, Jr.,
who comprise the living membership of the ''Oak Ridge 85'';

and the late Reverend Paul Turner, whose bravery and defiance on December 4, 1956, advanced the cause of integration on behalf of countless generations of young Black Americans.

I pray the American people will hold close the example set by these freedom fighters. I thank them for their bravery, their sacrifice, and above all their belief that love can overcome irredeemable evil, if only we have the courage to welcome it in.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO JESSICA SAUM

● Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to outstanding educator Jessica Saum, who was named 2022 Arkansas Teacher of the Year.

As a special education teacher at Stagecoach Elementary in Cabot, AR, Jessica has demonstrated her excellence in the classroom time and time again by helping each student reach their full potential.

She has provided unique opportunities for her students and engaged with the community to bring learning to life in her classroom. The creativity she brings to each lesson allows her students to learn and grow in exciting and distinct ways.

Just as impressive is the commitment that Jessica exudes beyond the

classroom. She was recognized as the 2020 314th Airlift Wing Key Spouse of the Year at the Little Rock Air Force Base for her volunteer work. Mrs. Saum is a remarkable military spouse, teacher, and advocate for children with special needs.

Her passion for and commitment to education can be seen by Jessica's own pursuit of learning. She obtained a bachelor of science in early childhood and special education, a master of science in special education educational specialist (4–12), and a graduate certificate as a special education director from Arkansas State University.

We are fortunate to have Jessica representing the many great teachers in Arkansas, as well as serving as a role model to future generations of Natural State educators.

I congratulate Jessica for this achievement and all of her contributions to her community and our State. Her determination, devotion, and commitment to her students and the field of education, in addition to her support for our military members and their families, is exemplary. I am encouraged by her efforts to inspire our future generations and her passion to help them to succeed.●

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF KHOZ

● Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 75th anniversary of KHOZ.

When KHOZ was established in 1946, its founders were dedicated to the task of bringing the people of Boone County a quality radio program for the whole family. That became a reality on September 28, 1946, when the station aired its first broadcast.

These hard-working Arkansans connected Boone County, as the county's first radio station began sharing news, sports programming, and music with citizens in the region.

Today, the staff at KHOZ continues this task, having successfully earned the admiration and trust of the Harrison community. This radio station has been a staple in the area, from providing jobs to keeping its listeners informed and bringing good times and good music over the airwaves. KHOZ has remained a source of comfort and joy for so many Harrison residents, and I am confident it will continue to do so for many years.

To recognize this milestone, the KHOZ team has thoughtfully put together a video documentary commemorating its staff's many years of dedication to bettering the station and the community. The documentary showcases the familiar hosts and the stories they have shared with family, friends and coworkers. It also highlights the rich history of the station and follows its growth over the years. I am honored to have been able to contribute to this celebration.

KHOZ's commitment to the community and its listeners is a testament to this station's values and dedication to the vision of its founders. By instilling a sense of familiarity over the years, listeners have connected with the station and developed special relationships with their favorite hosts. This public service has become a cherished piece of the region's history and daily life.

Congratulations to KHOZ on its 75th anniversary and for the countless memories it has created for its listeners. I look forward to its continued success for years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO JIM HART

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today I have the honor of recognizing Madison County commissioner Jim Hart for his 15 years of service to the citizens of Madison County, MT.

Jim was sworn in on January 1, 2007, and never looked back. He tackled a variety of tough issues impacting a large county in southwest Montana. From the Barney Bridge to the Ennis-Big Sky Airport, local infrastructure was critically important to Jim and his constituents.

Fellow Madison Commissioners Dan Allhands and Ron Nye shared a quip that Commissioner Hart often told them and fellow Madisonians after local projects were completed. They said, ''You done good.'' And I agree. Jim's calm demeanor was an effective tool in his toolbox that allowed him to be especially effective serving his constituents and rise in stature across our great State.

Commissioner Hart became only the second commissioner in the history of Madison County to be elected president of Montana Association of Counties, otherwise known as MACo. Commissioner Jason Strouf from Custer County and MACo's current president said, ''Commissioner Hart is a truly honorable and kind leader who has been steadfast in his service to Madison County as well as all counties in Montana. Our members, through Jim's tenure as MACo President, quickly became familiar with—and learned from—his quiet yet resolute governing skills. It has been an honor and a privilege to know Commissioner Hart.''

I am grateful for Jim's dedication and passion to serving Montana. He has surely left Madison County with large shoes to fill.●

TRIBUTE TO DANIEL HUTCHINSON

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today I have the distinct honor of recognizing Daniel Hutchinson of Roosevelt County as Montanan of the Month for his acts of heroism and leadership following the tragic Amtrak derailment that occurred in Joplin, MT, last month.

Daniel and his son Joshua were two of the 141 passengers on board the Empire Builder train headed to Seattle on September 25, 2021. That afternoon, tragedy struck. The train derailed in rural Montana between Joplin and Chester. After the crash, Daniel didn't hesitate to jump into action and help fellow passengers aboard the train.

His years of military training prepared him to act swiftly and selflessly to identify injured passengers and help others off the train. Daniel immediately took control of the situation, making his way through the train and calling out to locate trapped or injured passengers.

After the accident, Daniel stated that he said a prayer thanking the Lord for putting him in the right place at the right time. He did everything he could to get others out of harm's way, and I believe the passengers Daniel helped are also saying a prayer of thanks for his heroic actions.

His kindness and leadership extend far beyond that fateful day. Daniel's son, Joshua, describes him as a good neighbor, an avid outdoorsman, and an advocate for veterans. Joshua says his dad is a true Montanan in every sense of the word, and I couldn't agree more.

It is my honor to recognize Daniel for his quick and decisive actions on the day of that horrific accident and for his everyday acts of service that make Montana a better place.●

RECOGNIZING THE HANOVER HIGH SCHOOL WILDCATS

● Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the achievements of Hanover High School in Washington County, KS. I want to offer my congratulations to the students, staff, and coaches of the Wildcats football, volleyball, boys basketball, and boys track team for winning the Kansas 1A DII High School State Championships during the 2020–2021 academic school year.

After the challenges of the pandemic, the ability of these student athletes to succeed in the classroom and on the field is admirable. Continuing education and supporting student athletes is a top priority in Kansas, and these students exemplify how resilient our children are and the importance of being a part of a team. Achievements such as these do not happen overnight; they take the support of families, friends, teachers, coaches, faculty, staff, and volunteers. It takes a community, and Hanover should be proud.

The Hanover Wildcats started the year coming out strong when the volleyball team won the State title for the first time since 1979 in straight sets against Attica High. The eight-man football team championship game against St. Francis, leading 46–24, ended a perfect 11–0 season. The boys basketball team went on to win Hanover's seventh State championship with a 24–1 record, while the boys' track team rounded out the year coming back against the odds to clinch the first place spot in the final relay at the State track meet, leaving with a lead of eight points.

These young men and women have set an example for all of us, demonstrating that success in life comes to

those who are willing to set goals and work hard to achieve them. Not only did they perform with exceptional mental and physical fortitude, but they also displayed remarkable sportsmanship while prioritizing work in the classroom and studying hard. This impressive display of prudence after a challenging school year demonstrates the grit of Hanover students in the face of difficulties.

I once again extend my congratulations to these student athletes, as well as Principal Matthew Mattos, Athletic Director Scott Hutchison, and trainer Paige Radomski.

I wish each of these young men and women continued success in the classroom and in their athletic pursuits.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Swann, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:20 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2119. An act to amend the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act to make improvements.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2119. An act to amend the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act to make improvements.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–2420. A communication from the Acting Chief Privacy and Civil Liberties Officer, Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation''' (CPCLO Order No. 009–2021) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2021; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2421. A communication from the Agency Representative, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Electronic Submission of a Sequence Listing, a Large Table, or a Computer Program Listing Appendix in Patent Applications'' (RIN0651–AD48) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2021; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2422. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Propamocarb; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 8871–01–OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2021; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2423. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Timothy G. Szymanski, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2424. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the continuation of the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia that was originally declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2425. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 14024 with respect to specified harmful foreign activities of the Government of the Russian Federation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2426. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 12170 with respect to Iran; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2427. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13536 with respect to Somalia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2428. A communication from the Acting Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Canada, Mexico, and Saudi Arabia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2429. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of Time and Required Disclosures for Notification of Nonpayment of Rent'' (RIN2501–AD99) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2021; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2430. A communication from the Supervisor, Human Resources Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Environmental Protection Agency, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2431. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Wisconsin; Attainment Plan for the Rhinelander SO2 Nonattainment area'' (FRL No. 8692–02–R5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2432. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; Sacramento Metro Area; 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area Requirements'' (FRL No. 8723–02–R9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2433. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Nevada; Las Vegas Valley; Second 10-Year Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan'' (FRL No. 8725–02–R9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2434. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Washington: Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program Revisions, Codification and Incorporation by Reference'' (FRL No. 8849–01–R10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2435. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Rhode Island; Infrastructure State Implementation Plan Requirements for the 2015 Ozone Standard'' (FRL No. 8855–02–R1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2436. A communication from the Senior Advisor, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to two (2) vacancies in the Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2021; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2437. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulations to Improve Administration and Enforcement of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Laws'' (RIN0625–AB10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 19, 2021; to the Committee on Finance.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 3080. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a group health plan (or health insurance coverage offered in connection with such a plan) to provide for cost-sharing for oral anticancer drugs on terms no less favorable than the cost-sharing provided for anticancer medications administered by a health care provider; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 3081. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit withdrawals from certain retirement plans for repayment of student loan debt, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 3082. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit Amtrak from including mandatory arbitration clauses in contracts of carriage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 3083. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve veterinary care for retired military working dogs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 3084. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to provide for the termination of telephone, multichannel video programming, and internet access service contracts by servicemembers after the receipt of stop movement orders due to an emergency situation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 3085. A bill to assist in the transition of a certain hospital to a Medicare rural emergency hospital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. LUMMIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. MORAN, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 3086. A bill to require the Energy Information Administration to submit to Congress and make publicly available an annual report on Federal agency policies and regulations and Executive orders that have increased or may increase energy prices in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 3087. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide authority to add additional vaccines to the list of taxable vaccines; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 3088. A bill to ensure America's children have the freedom to be healthy, to be economically secure, to learn, to not be hungry, and to be safe from harm; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 3089. A bill to amend section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 to include the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health and Human Services as members of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States and to require the Committee to consider the security of the food and agriculture systems of the United States as a factor to be considered when determining to take action with respect to foreign investment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 3090. A bill to address the participation of Taiwan in the Inter-American Development Bank; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. OSSOFF (for himself, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 3091. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish the advanced solar manufacturing production credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 3092. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to improve the provision of certain disaster assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 3093. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to improve the provision of certain disaster assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MARSHALL, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 3094. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve homeless veterans reintegration programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. DAINES, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. Res. 429. A resolution designating October 26, 2021, as the ''Day of the Deployed''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KING, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. Res. 430. A resolution calling on Congress, schools, and State and local educational agencies to recognize the significant educational implications of dyslexia that must be addressed, and designating October 2021 as ''National Dyslexia Awareness Month''; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 79

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 79, a bill to eliminate the disparity in sentencing for cocaine offenses, and for other purposes.

S. 212

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 212, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable tax credit against income tax for the purchase of qualified access technology for the blind.

S. 657

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 657, a bill to modify the presumption of service connection for veterans who were exposed to herbicide agents while serving in the Armed Forces in Thailand during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes.

S. 819

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 819, a bill to enhance the security of the United States and its allies, and for other purposes.

S. 926

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 926, a bill to plan, develop, and make recommendations to increase access to sexual assault examinations for survivors by holding hospitals accountable and supporting the providers that serve them.

S. 945

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 945, a bill to provide temporary impact aid construction grants to eligible local educational agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 1210

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1210, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, to further the conservation of certain wildlife species, and for other purposes.

S. 1220

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1220, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize and honor the service of individuals who served in the United States Cadet Nurse Corps during World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1625

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1625, a bill to authorize notaries public to perform, and to establish minimum standards for, electronic notarizations and remote notarizations that occur in or affect interstate commerce, to require any Federal court to recognize notarizations performed by a notarial officer of any State, to require any State to recognize notarizations performed by a notarial officer of any other State when the notarization was performed under or relates to a public Act, record, or judicial proceeding of

the notarial officer's State or when the notarization occurs in or affects interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

S. 1965

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1965, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to improve long-term care provided to veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1972

At the request of Mr. KELLY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1972, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve dependent coverage under the TRICARE Young Adult Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2107

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2107, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish the semiconductor manufacturing investment credit.

S. 2144

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2144, a bill to clarify the eligibility for participation of peer support specialists in the furnishing of behavioral health integration services under the Medicare program.

S. 2233

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2233, a bill to establish a grant program for shuttered minor league baseball clubs, and for other purposes.

S. 2342

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 2342, a bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration of disputes involving sexual assault and sexual harassment.

S. 2372

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2372, a bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to make supplemental funds available for management of fish and wildlife species of greatest conservation need as determined by State fish and wildlife agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 2513

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2513, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the application and review process of the Department of Veterans Affairs for clothing allowance claims submitted by veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 2652

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2652, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to clarify congressional intent and preserve patient access to home infusion therapy under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 2666

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2666, a bill to address threats relating to ransomware, and for other purposes.

S. 2879

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2879, a bill to provide that Executive Orders 14042 and 14043 shall have no force or effect.

S. 2889

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 2889, a bill to amend the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 to address the timing for the use of funds with respect to grants made to shuttered venue operators.

S. 2945

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2945, a bill to include sexual assault and aggravated sexual violence in the definition of aggravated felonies under the Immigration and Nationality Act in order to expedite the removal of aliens convicted of such crimes.

S. 3028

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3028, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to make grants to, and enter into cooperative agreements with, States and units of local government to develop, implement, or expand 1 or more programs to provide medication-assisted treatment to individuals who have opioid use disorder and are incarcerated within the jurisdictions of the States or units of local government.

S. 3079

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) were added as cosponsors of S. 3079, a bill to exempt essential workers from Federal COVID–19 vaccine mandates.

AMENDMENT NO. 3871

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3871 intended to be proposed to H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3885

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3885 intended to be proposed to H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3887

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3887 intended to be proposed to H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3895

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3895 intended to be proposed to H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 429—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 26, 2021, AS THE ''DAY OF THE DEPLOYED''

Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. DAINES, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. WARNOCK) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 429

Whereas more than 2,100,000 individuals serve as members of the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas several hundred thousand members of the Armed Forces rotate each year through deployments to more than 150 countries and every region of the world;

Whereas more than 2,000,000 members of the Armed Forces have deployed to the area of operations of the United States Central

Command since the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks;

Whereas, for nearly 20 years following the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, members of the Armed Forces deployed throughout Afghanistan, and their service and bravery helped protect the United States from further terrorist attacks;

Whereas the United States is kept strong and free by the loyal military personnel from the total force, which is comprised of active components and the National Guard and the Reserves, who protect the precious heritage of the United States through their declarations and actions;

Whereas the United States remains committed to providing the fullest possible accounting for personnel missing from past conflicts ranging from World War II through current day conflicts;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces serving at home and abroad have courageously answered the call to duty to defend the ideals of the United States and to preserve peace and freedom around the world;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces continue to serve and protect the people of the United States by making deployments in the midst of the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID–19) pandemic;

Whereas the United States remains committed to easing the transition from deployment abroad to service at home for members of the Armed Forces and the families of the members;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces personify the virtues of patriotism, service, duty, courage, and sacrifice;

Whereas the families of members of the Armed Forces make important and significant sacrifices for the United States; and

Whereas the Senate has designated October 26 as the ''Day of the Deployed'' since 2011: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates October 26, 2021, as the ''Day of the Deployed'';

(2) honors the deployed members of the Armed Forces of the United States and the families of the members;

(3) calls on the people of the United States to reflect on the service of those members of the Armed Forces, wherever the members serve, past, present, and future;

(4) is forever grateful for the uniformed men and women who served in Afghanistan and calls on the people of the United States to remember and honor their service; and

(5) encourages the people of the United States to observe the Day of the Deployed with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 430—CALLING ON CONGRESS, SCHOOLS, AND STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES TO RECOGNIZE THE SIGNIFICANT EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF DYSLEXIA THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED, AND DESIGNATING OCTOBER 2021 AS ''NATIONAL DYSLEXIA AWARENESS MONTH''

Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KING, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. WARNOCK) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 430

Whereas dyslexia is—

(1) defined as an unexpected difficulty in reading for an individual who has the intelligence to be a much better reader; and

(2) most commonly caused by a difficulty in phonological processing (the appreciation of the individual sounds of spoken language), which affects the ability of an individual to speak, read, spell, and, often, the ability to learn a second language;

Whereas the First Step Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–391; 132 Stat. 5194 et seq.) included a definition of dyslexia as part of the requirement of the Act to screen inmates for dyslexia upon intake in Federal prisons;

Whereas the definition of dyslexia in section 3635 of title 18, United States Code, as added by section 101(a) of the First Step Act of 2018, is the first and only definition of dyslexia in a Federal statute;

Whereas dyslexia is the most common learning disability and affects 80 to 90 percent of all individuals with a learning disability;

Whereas dyslexia is persistent and highly prevalent, affecting as many as 1 out of every 5 individuals;

Whereas dyslexia is a paradox, in that an individual with dyslexia may have both—

(1) weaknesses in decoding that result in difficulties with accurate or fluent word recognition; and

(2) strengths in higher-level cognitive functions, such as reasoning, critical thinking, concept formation, and problem solving;

Whereas great progress has been made in understanding dyslexia on a scientific level, including the epidemiology and cognitive and neurobiological bases of dyslexia;

Whereas the achievement gap between typical readers and dyslexic readers occurs as early as first grade; and

Whereas early screening for, and early diagnosis of, dyslexia are critical for ensuring that individuals with dyslexia receive focused, evidence-based intervention that leads to fluent reading, the promotion of self-awareness and self-empowerment, and the provision of necessary accommodations that ensure success in school and in life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) calls on Congress, schools, and State and local educational agencies to recognize that dyslexia has significant educational implications that must be addressed; and

(2) designates October 2021 as ''National Dyslexia Awareness Month''.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3914. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3915. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3916. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. ROUNDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3917. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3918. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3919. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3920. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3921. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3922. Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3923. Mr. WARNOCK (for himself, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3924. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3925. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Ms. HASSAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3926. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. YOUNG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3927. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3928. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3929. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3930. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3931. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3932. Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3933. Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. CRAMER) submitted an amendment intended

to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3934. Mrs. HYDE-SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3935. Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3936. Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Mr. CRAMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3937. Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Mr. CRAMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3938. Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3939. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3940. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3914. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title V, insert the following:

SEC. _____. CONCURRENT USE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TUITION ASSISTANCE AND MONTGOMERY GI BILL-SELECTED RESERVE BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 16131 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(k)(1) In the case of an individual entitled to educational assistance under this chapter who is pursuing education or training described in subsection (a) or (c) of section 2007 of this title on a half-time or more basis, the Secretary concerned shall, at the election of the individual, pay the individual educational assistance allowance under this chapter for pursuit of such education or training as if the individual were not also eligible to receive or in receipt of educational assistance under section 2007 for pursuit of such education or training.

''(2) Concurrent receipt of educational assistance under section 2007 of this title and educational assistance under this chapter shall not be considered a duplication of benefits if the individual is enrolled in a program of education on a half-time or more basis.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2007(d) of such title is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''or chapter 1606 of this title'' after ''of title 38''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting '', in the case of educational assistance under chapter 30 of such title, and section 16131(k), in the case of educational assistance under chapter 1606 of this title'' before the period at the end.

SA 3915. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1264. HUMAN RIGHTS PROTECTION FOR JOURNALISTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Jamal Khashoggi Press Freedom Accountability Act of 2021''.

(b) EXPANDING SCOPE OF HUMAN RIGHTS REPORTS WITH RESPECT TO VIOLATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS OF JOURNALISTS.—The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 116(d)(12) (22 U.S.C. 2151n(d)(12))—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively;

(B) in subparagraph (C), as redesignated, by striking ''imprisonment, indirect sources of pressure'' and inserting ''online harassment, imprisonment, indirect sources of pressure, surveillance'';

(C) in subparagraph (D)(ii), as redesignated, by striking ''the prosecution of those individuals who attack or murder journalists'' and inserting ''the investigation, prosecution, and conviction of government officials or private individuals who engage in or facilitate digital or physical attacks (including hacking, censorship, surveillance, harassment, unlawful imprisonment, or bodily harm) against journalists and others who perform, or provide administrative support to, the dissemination of print, broadcast, internet-based, or social media intended to communicate facts or opinion.''; and

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) the identification of countries in which gross violations of internationally recognized human rights (as defined in section 502B(d)(1)) were committed against journalists during the reporting period;''; and

(2) in section 502B (22 U.S.C. 2304)—

(A) by redesignating the second subsection (i) (as added by section 1207(b)(2) of Public Law 113–4) as subsection (j);

(B) in subsection (i)—

(i) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively;

(ii) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) the identification of countries in which there were gross violations of internationally recognized human rights committed against journalists;''; and

(iii) in paragraph (3), as redesignated, by striking ''imprisonment, indirect sources of pressure,'' and inserting ''online harassment, imprisonment, indirect sources of pressure, surveillance,''.

(c) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS ON PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE COMMISSION OF GROSS VIOLATIONS OF INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HUMAN RIGHTS AGAINST JOURNALISTS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) ADMITTED; ALIEN.—The terms ''admitted'' and ''alien'' have the meanings given such terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1001).

(B) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term ''foreign person'' means an individual who is not—

(i) a citizen or national of the United States; or

(ii) an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States.

(C) GOOD.—The term ''good'' means any article, natural or man-made substance, material, supply, or manufactured product, including inspection and test equipment and excluding technical data.

(D) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ''United States person'' means—

(i) a United States citizen, an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States, or any other individual subject to the jurisdiction of the United States;

(ii) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or of any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such entity; or

(iii) any person in the United States.

(2) LISTING OF PERSONS WHO HAVE COMMITTED GROSS VIOLATIONS OF INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HUMAN RIGHTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), the President shall impose the sanctions described in paragraph (3) on each foreign person who the President determines, based on credible information, has perpetrated, ordered, or otherwise directed the extrajudicial killing of, or other gross violation of internationally recognized human rights committed against, a journalist or other person who performs, or provides administrative support to, the dissemination of print, broadcast, internet-based, or social media intended to report newsworthy activities or information, or communicate facts or fact-based opinions.

(B) PUBLICATION OF LIST.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), the Secretary of State shall annually publish, on a publicly available website of the Department of State, a list of the names of each foreign person determined pursuant to subparagraph (A) to have perpetrated, ordered, or otherwise directed an act described in such subparagraph.

(C) EXCEPTION.—The President may waive or terminate the imposition of sanctions otherwise required under subparagraph (A) and the Secretary of State may omit or remove from the list described in subparagraph (B) on behalf of a foreign person described in subparagraph (A) if the President—

(i) certifies to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that—

(I) the public identification of such foreign person is not in the national interest of the United States; or

(II) appropriate foreign government authorities have credibly—

(aa) investigated such foreign person and held such foreign person accountable, as appropriate, for perpetrating, ordering, or directing the acts described in subparagraph (A);

(bb) publicly condemned the violations of the freedom of the press and the acts described in subparagraph (A);

(cc) complied with any requests for information from international or regional

human rights organizations with respect to the acts described in subparagraph (A); and

(dd) complied with any United States Government requests for information with respect to the acts described in subparagraph (A).

(ii) submits to such congressional committees an unclassified description of the factual basis supporting the certification provided under clause (i), which may contain a classified annex.

(3) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this paragraph are the following:

(A) ASSET BLOCKING.—The President shall exercise all of the powers granted to the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in property and interests in property of a foreign person identified in the list required under paragraph (2)(B) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(B) INELIGIBILITY FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—

(i) VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—A foreign person described in paragraph (2)(A) is—

(I) inadmissible to the United States;

(II) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

(III) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(ii) CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The visa or other entry documentation of a foreign person described in paragraph (2)(A) is subject to revocation regardless of when the visa or other entry documentation is or was issued.

(II) IMMEDIATE EFFECT.—A revocation under subclause (I) shall take effect on the date on which the President makes a determination under paragraph (2)(A) with respect to such foreign person and any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the foreign person's possession shall be automatically canceled.

(C) EXCEPTIONS.—

(i) EXCEPTION FOR INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.—The sanctions described in this paragraph shall not apply to any activity subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) or any authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

(ii) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS.—The sanctions described in this paragraph shall not apply with respect to an alien if admitting or paroling the alien into the United States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations.

(4) IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES.—

(A) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this subsection.

(B) PENALTIES.—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a foreign person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of this subsection to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of such section 206.

(5) EXCEPTION RELATING TO THE IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—The authorities and requirements to impose sanctions under this section shall not include any authority or requirement to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(d) PROHIBITION ON FOREIGN ASSISTANCE.—

(1) PROHIBITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Assistance authorized under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) or the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) may not be made available to any governmental entity of a country if the Secretary of State or the Director of National Intelligence has credible information that one or more officials associated with, leading, or otherwise acting under the authority of such entity has committed a gross violation of internationally recognized human rights against a journalist or other person who performs, or provides administrative support to, the dissemination of print, broadcast, internet-based, or social media intended to report newsworthy activities or information, or communicate facts or fact-based opinions.

(B) PUBLICATION.—To the maximum extent practicable, a list of the governmental entities described in subparagraph (A)—

(i) shall be published on publicly available websites of the Department of State and of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence; and

(ii) shall be updated on a regular basis.

(2) PROMPT INFORMATION.—The Secretary of State shall promptly inform appropriate officials of the government of a country from which assistance is withheld in accordance with the prohibition under paragraph (1).

(3) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition under paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to—

(A) humanitarian assistance or disaster relief assistance authorized under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.); or

(B) assistance that the Secretary of State determines to be essential to assist the government of a country to bring the responsible members of the relevant governmental entity to justice for the acts described in paragraph (1).

(4) WAIVER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition under paragraph (1) with respect to a governmental entity of a country if—

(i) the President, acting through the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, determines that such a waiver is in the national security interest of the United States; or

(ii) the Secretary of State has received credible information that the government of that country has—

(I) performed a thorough investigation of the acts described in paragraph (1) and is taking effective steps to bring responsible members of the relevant governmental entity to justice;

(II) condemned violations of the freedom of the press and the acts described in paragraph (1);

(III) complied with any requests for information from international or regional human rights organizations with respect to the acts described in paragraph (1), in accordance with international legal obligations to protect the freedom of expression; and

(IV) complied with United States Government requests for information with respect to the acts described in paragraph (1).

(B) CERTIFICATION.—A waiver described in subparagraph (A) may only take effect if, not later than 30 days before the effective date of the waiver—

(i) the Secretary of State—

(I) certifies to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives that such waiver is warranted; and

(II) includes, with such certification, an unclassified description of the factual basis supporting the certification, which may contain a classified annex; and

(ii) the Director of National Intelligence submits a report to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives detailing any underlying information that the intelligence community (as defined in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003)) has regarding the perpetrators of the acts described in paragraph (1), which shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

SA 3916. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. ROUNDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 728. MANDATORY TRAINING ON TREATMENT OF EATING DISORDERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall furnish to each medical professional who provides direct care services under the military health system a mandatory training, consistent with generally accepted standards of care, on—

(1) how to screen for the severe mental illness of an eating disorder;

(2) how to intervene with respect to such illness; and

(3) how to refer patients to treatment for such illness.

(b) ANNUAL UPDATES TO TRAINING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than annually thereafter, the Secretary shall evaluate the training furnished under subsection (a) to determine if updates are warranted to ensure continued consistency of training with generally accepted standards of care.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in conjunction with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall submit to Congress a report on the current practices of the Department of Defense regarding training described in subsection (a).

SA 3917. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal

year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10___. EXPANSION OF MEMBERSHIP OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON MINORITY VETERANS TO INCLUDE VETERANS WHO ARE LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, TRANSGENDER, GENDER DIVERSE, GENDER NON-CONFORMING, INTERSEX, OR QUEER.

(a) EXPANSION OF MEMBERSHIP.—Subsection (a)(2)(A) of section 544 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in clause (iv), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in clause (v), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by inserting after clause (v) the following new clause:

''(vi) veterans who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, gender diverse, gender nonconforming, intersex, or queer.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Clause (vi) of section 544(a)(2)(A) of title 38, United States Code, shall apply to appointments made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 3918. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1064. TRAINING FOR PERSONNEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS WITH RESPECT TO EXPOSURE OF VETERANS TO TOXIC SUBSTANCES.

(a) HEALTH CARE PERSONNEL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall provide to health care personnel of the Department of Veterans Affairs education and training to identify, treat, and assess the impact on veterans of illnesses related to exposure to toxic substances and inform such personnel of how to ask for additional information from veterans regarding exposure to different toxicants.

(b) BENEFITS PERSONNEL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a training program for processors of claims under the laws administered by the Secretary who review claims for disability benefits relating to service-connected disabilities based on exposure to toxic substances.

(2) ANNUAL TRAINING.—Training provided to processors under paragraph (1) shall be provided not less frequently than annually.

SA 3919. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. REPORT ON MATERIAL READINESS OF VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINES OF THE NAVY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the material readiness of the Virginia class submarines.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the number of components and parts that have required replacement prior to the end of their estimated useful life or scheduled replacement timeline, including efforts to increase the reliability of ''life of ship'' components.

(2) An assessment of the extent to which part and material shortages have impacted deployment and maintenance availability schedules, including an estimate of the number of active part cannibalizations or other actions taken to mitigate those impacts.

(3) An identification of the planned lead time to obtain key material for Virginia class submarines from shipbuilders and vendors.

(4) An identification of the actual lead time to obtain such material from shipbuilders and vendors.

(5) An identification of the cost increases of key components and parts for new construction and maintenance availabilities above planned material costs.

(6) An assessment of potential courses of action to improve the material readiness of the Virginia class submarines, including efforts to align new construction shipyards with maintenance shipyards and Naval Sea Systems Command to increase predictability of materials and purchasing power.

(7) Such recommendations as the Secretary may have for legislative changes, authorities, realignments, and administrative actions, including reforms of the Federal Acquisition Regulation, to improve the material readiness of the Virginia class submarines.

(8) Such other elements as the Secretary considers appropriate.

SA 3920. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. MICROLOAN PROGRAM DEFINITIONS.

Section 7(m)(11) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)(11)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C)(ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) the term 'State' means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa.''.

SA 3921. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 10___. DEFINITION OF STATE.

Section 901(a)(2) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10251(a)(2)) is amended by striking ''Northern Mariana Islands'' and all that follows through ''Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.'' and inserting ''Northern Mariana Islands;''.

SA 3922. Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title III, add the following:

SEC. 376. IMPROVED OVERSIGHT FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF SHIPYARD INFRASTRUCTURE OPTIMIZATION PROGRAM OF THE NAVY.

(a) UPDATED PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30, 2022, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the congressional defense committees an update to the plan of the Secretary for implementation of the Shipyard Infrastructure Optimization Program of the Department of the Navy, with the objective of providing increased transparency for the actual costs and schedules associated with infrastructure optimization activities for shipyards covered by such program.

(2) UPDATED COST ESTIMATES.—The updated plan required under paragraph (1) shall include updated cost estimates comprising the most recent costs of capital improvement projects for each of the four public shipyards covered by the Shipyard Infrastructure Optimization Program.

(b) BRIEFING REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before the start of physical construction with respect to a covered project, the Secretary of the Navy or a designee of the Secretary shall brief each of the congressional defense committees on such project, regardless of the source of funding for such project.

(2) WRITTEN INFORMATION.—Before conducting a briefing under paragraph (1) with respect to a covered project, the Secretary of the Navy or a designee of the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees in writing the following information:

(A) An updated cost estimate for such project that—

(i) meets the standards of the Association for the Advancement of Cost Engineering for a Level 1 or Level 2 cost estimate; or

(ii) is an independent cost estimate.

(B) A schedule for such project that is comprehensive, well-constructed, credible, and

controlled pursuant to the Schedule Assessment Guide: Best Practices for Project Schedules (GAO–16–89G) set forth by the Comptroller General of the United States in December 2015, or successor guide.

(C) An estimate of the likelihood that programmed and planned funds for such project will be sufficient for the completion of the project.

(3) COVERED PROJECT DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''covered project'' means a shipyard project under the Shipyard Infrastructure Optimization Program—

(A) with a contract awarded on or after October 1, 2024; and

(B) valued at $250,000,000 or more.

(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31, 2022, and not later than December 31 of each year thereafter, the Commander of the Naval Sea Systems Command, in coordination with the Program Manager Ships 555, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report detailing the use by the Department of the Navy of funding for all efforts associated with the Shipyard Infrastructure Optimization Program, including the use of amounts made available by law to support the projects identified in the plan to implement such program, including any update to such plan under subsection (a).

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall include updated cost and schedule estimates—

(A) for the plan to implement the Shipyard Optimization Program, including any update to such plan under subsection (a); and

(B) for each dry dock, major facility, and infrastructure project valued at $250,000,000 or more under such program.

(d) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT.—

(1) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than May 1, 2023, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the progress of the Secretary of the Navy in implementing the Shipyard Infrastructure Optimization Program, including—

(i) the progress of the Secretary in completing the first annual report required under such program; and

(ii) the cost and schedule estimates for full implementation of such program.

(B) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) An assessment of the extent to which the cost estimate for the updated optimization plan for the Shipyard Infrastructure Optimization Program is consistent with leading practices for cost estimation.

(ii) An assessment of the extent to which the project schedule for such program is comprehensive, well-constructed, credible, and controlled.

(iii) An assessment of whether programmed and planned funds for a project under such program will be sufficient for the completion of the project.

(iv) Such other related matters as the Comptroller General considers appropriate.

(2) INITIAL BRIEFING.—Not later than April 1, 2023, the Comptroller General shall brief the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the preliminary findings of the report under paragraph (1).

SA 3923. Mr. WARNOCK (for himself, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 2831 and insert the following:

SEC. 2831. CONSIDERATION OF PUBLIC EDUCATION WHEN MAKING BASING DECISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2883 of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116–283) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e) through (j) as subsections (f) through (k), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection (e):

''(e) EDUCATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—With regard to a military housing area in which an installation subject to a basing decision covered by subsection (a) is or will be located, the Secretary of the military department concerned shall take into account the extent to which high-quality public education is available and accessible to dependents of members of the Armed Forces in the military housing area by comparing progress of students served by relevant local educational agencies described in paragraph (4) under the statewide accountability system described in section 1111 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311) as compared to the progress of all students in such State under such system.''.

''(2) TRANSPARENCY.—The Secretary of the military department concerned shall ensure transparency in the factors used to make basing decisions under this section, including, as appropriate, by coordinating with the relevant local educational agencies to ensure that data used in carrying out paragraph (1) is publicly available and accessible to impacted communities.

''(3) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out paragraph (1) with respect to an installation subject to a basing decision covered by subsection (a), the Secretary of the military department concerned shall consult with and seek input from leadership and education liaisons for the installation and State, local, and Tribal education agencies.

''(4) RELEVANT LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES DESCRIBED.—Relevant local educational agencies described in this paragraph include—

''(A) local educational agencies that serve dependents of members of the Armed Forces in the State in which the military housing area described in paragraph (1) is located; and

''(B) local educational agencies in such State that serve or would be likely to serve a significant number or percentage of dependents of members of the Armed Forces in the military housing area described in paragraph (1) as determined by the Secretary of the military department concerned, in consultation with the education liaisons for the installation described in such paragraph.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a) of such section is amended by striking ''subsection (e)'' and inserting ''subsection (f)''

SA 3924. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title V, add the following:

SEC. 596. INCLUSION OF PURPLE HEART AWARDS ON MILITARY VALOR WEBSITE.

The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the publicly accessible internet website of the Department of Defense that lists individuals who have been awarded certain military awards includes a list of each individual who meets each of the following criteria:

(1) The individual is awarded the Purple Heart for qualifying actions that occur after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) The individual elects to be included on such list (or, if the individual is deceased, the primary next of kin elects the individual to be included on such list).

(3) The public release of the individual's name does not constitute a security risk, as determined by the Secretary of the military department concerned.

SA 3925. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Ms. HASSAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1013. BLOCKING DEADLY FENTANYL IMPORTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Blocking Deadly Fentanyl Imports Act''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 481(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''in which'';

(B) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''in which'' before ''1,000'';

(C) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by inserting ''in which'' before ''1,000''; and

(ii) by striking ''or'' at the end;

(D) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by inserting ''in which'' before ''5,000''; and

(ii) by inserting ''or'' after the semicolon; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) that is a significant source of illicit synthetic opioids significantly affecting the United States;''; and

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) assistance that furthers the objectives set forth in paragraphs (1) through (4) of section 664(b) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (22 U.S.C. 2151n–2(b));

''(F) assistance to combat trafficking authorized under the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.)); and

''(G) global health assistance authorized under sections 104 through 104C of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151b through 22 U.S.C. 2151b–4).''.

(c) INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL STRATEGY REPORT.—Section 489(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291h(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(10) A separate section that contains the following:

''(A) An identification of the countries, to the extent feasible, that are the most significant sources of illicit fentanyl and fentanyl analogues significantly affecting the United States during the preceding calendar year.

''(B) A description of the extent to which each country identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) has cooperated with the United States to prevent the articles or chemicals described in subparagraph (A) from being exported from such country to the United States.

''(C) A description of whether each country identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) has adopted and utilizes scheduling or other procedures for illicit drugs that are similar in effect to the procedures authorized under title II of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 811 et seq.) for adding drugs and other substances to the controlled substances schedules;

''(D) A description of whether each country identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) is following steps to prosecute individuals involved in the illicit manufacture or distribution of controlled substance analogues (as defined in section 102(32) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(32)); and

''(E) A description of whether each country identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) requires the registration of tableting machines and encapsulating machines or other measures similar in effect to the registration requirements set forth in part 1310 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, and has not made good faith efforts, in the opinion of the Secretary, to improve regulation of tableting machines and encapsulating machines.''.

(d) WITHHOLDING OF BILATERAL AND MULTILATERAL ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 490(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291j(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''or country identified pursuant to clause (i) or (ii) of section 489(a)(8)(A) of this Act'' and inserting ''country identified pursuant to section 489(a)(8)(A), or country thrice identified during a 5-year period pursuant to section 489(a)(10)(A)''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''or major drug-transit country (as determined under subsection (h)) or country identified pursuant to clause (i) or (ii) of section 489(a)(8)(A) of this Act'' and inserting '', major drug-transit country, country identified pursuant to section 489(a)(8)(A), or country thrice identified during a 5-year period pursuant to section 489(a)(10)(A)''.

(2) DESIGNATION OF ILLICIT FENTANYL COUNTRIES WITHOUT SCHEDULING PROCEDURES.—Section 706(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (22 U.S.C. 2291j–1(2)) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''also'';

(B) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (D);

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) designate each country, if any, identified under section 489(a)(10) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291h(a)(10)) that has failed to adopt and utilize scheduling procedures for illicit drugs that are comparable to the procedures authorized under title II of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 811 et seq.) for adding drugs and other substances to the controlled substances schedules;''; and

(E) in subparagraph (D), as redesignated, by striking ''so designated'' and inserting ''designated under subparagraph (A), (B), or (C)''.

(3) DESIGNATION OF ILLICIT FENTANYL COUNTRIES WITHOUT ABILITY TO PROSECUTE CRIMINALS FOR THE MANUFACTURE OR DISTRIBUTION OF FENTANYL ANALOGUES.—Section 706(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (22 U.S.C. 2291j–1(2)), as amended by paragraph (2), is further amended by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) designate each country, if any, identified under section 489(a)(10) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291h(a)(10)) that has not taken significant steps to prosecute individuals involved in the illicit manufacture or distribution of controlled substance analogues (as defined in section 102(32) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(32));''.

(4) LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR DESIGNATED COUNTRIES.—Section 706(3) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (22 U.S.C. 2291j–1(3)) is amended by striking ''also designated under paragraph (2) in the report'' and inserting ''designated in the report under paragraph (2)(A) or thrice designated during a 5-year period in the report under subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (2)''.

(5) EXCEPTIONS TO THE LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE.—Section 706(5) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (22 U.S.C. 2291j–1(5)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (F);

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) Notwithstanding paragraph (3), assistance to promote democracy (as described in section 481(e)(4)(E) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291(e)(4)(E))) shall be provided to countries identified in a report under paragraph (1) and designated under subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (2), to the extent such countries are otherwise eligible for such assistance, regardless of whether the President reports to the appropriate congressional committees in accordance with such paragraph.

''(D) Notwithstanding paragraph (3), assistance to combat trafficking (as described in section 481(e)(4)(F) of such Act) shall be provided to countries identified in a report under paragraph (1) and designated under subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (2), to the extent such countries are otherwise eligible for such assistance, regardless of whether the President reports to the appropriate congressional committees in accordance with such paragraph.

''(E) Notwithstanding paragraph (3), global health assistance (as described in section 481(e)(4)(G) of such Act) shall be provided to countries identified in a report under paragraph (1) and designated under subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (2), to the extent such countries are otherwise eligible for such assistance, regardless of whether the President reports to the appropriate congressional committees in accordance with such paragraph''; and

(C) in subparagraph (F), as redesignated, by striking ''section clause (i) or (ii) of'' and inserting ''clause (i) or (ii) of section''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 3926. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. YOUNG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XII, add the following:

Subtitle H—Encouraging Normalization of Relations With Israel

SEC. 1291. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Israel Relations Normalization Act of 2021''.

SEC. 1292. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Support for peace between Israel and its neighbors has longstanding bipartisan support in Congress.

(2) For decades, Congress has promoted Israel's acceptance among Arab and other relevant countries and regions by passing numerous laws opposing efforts to boycott, isolate, and stigmatize America's ally, Israel.

(3) The recent peace and normalization agreements between Israel and several Arab states—the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Sudan, and Morocco—have the potential to fundamentally transform the security, diplomatic, and economic environment in the Middle East and North Africa and advance vital United States national security interests.

(4) These historic agreements could help advance peace between and among Israel, the Arab states, and other relevant countries and regions, further diplomatic openings, and enhance efforts towards a negotiated solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict resulting in two states—a democratic Jewish state of Israel and a viable, democratic Palestinian state—living side by side in peace, security, and mutual recognition.

(5) These agreements build upon the decades-long leadership of the United States Government in helping Israel broker peace treaties with Egypt and Jordan and promoting peace talks between Israel and Syria, Lebanon, and the Palestinians.

(6) These agreements also build on decades of private diplomatic and security engagement between Israel and countries in the region.

(7) These normalization and peace agreements could begin to transform the region by spurring economic growth, investment, and tourism, enhancing technological innovation, promoting security cooperation, bolstering water security and sustainable development, advancing understanding, and forging closer people-to-people relations.

SEC. 1293. APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.

In this subtitle, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1294. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to expand and strengthen the Abraham Accords to encourage other nations to normalize relations with Israel and ensure that existing agreements reap tangible security and economic benefits for the citizens of those countries;

(2) to develop and implement a regional strategy to encourage economic cooperation

between and among Israel, Arab states, and the Palestinians to enhance the prospects for peace, respect for human rights, transparent governance, and for cooperation to address water scarcity, climate solutions, health care, sustainable development, and other areas that result in benefits for residents of those countries and regions;

(3) to develop and implement a regional security strategy that recognizes the shared threat posed by Iran and violent extremist organizations, ensures sufficient United States deterrence in the region, builds partner capacity to address shared threats, and explores multilateral security arrangements built around like-minded partners;

(4) to support and encourage government-to-government and grassroots initiatives aimed at normalizing ties with the state of Israel and promoting people-to-people contact between Israelis, Arabs, and residents of other relevant countries and regions, including by expanding and enhancing the Abraham Accords;

(5) to support a negotiated solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict resulting in two states living side by side in peace, security, and mutual recognition;

(6) to implement the Nita M. Lowey Middle East Partnership for Peace Act (title VIII of division K of Public Law 116–260), which will support economic development and peacebuilding efforts among Israelis and Palestinians, in a manner which encourages regional allies to become international donors to these efforts;

(7) to oppose efforts to delegitimize the state of Israel and legal barriers to normalization with Israel; and

(8) to work to combat anti-Semitism and support normalization with Israel, including by countering anti-Semitic narratives on social media and state media and pressing for curricula reform in education.

SEC. 1295. UNITED STATES STRATEGY TO STRENGTHEN AND EXPAND THE ABRAHAM ACCORDS AND OTHER RELATED NORMALIZATION AGREEMENTS WITH ISRAEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development and the heads of other appropriate Federal departments and agencies, shall develop and submit to the appropriate congressional committees a strategy on expanding and strengthening the Abraham Accords.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) An assessment of future staffing and resourcing requirements of entities within the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, and other appropriate Federal departments and agencies with responsibility to coordinate United States efforts to expand and strengthen the Abraham Accords.

(2) An assessment of opportunities to further promote bilateral and multilateral cooperation between Israel, Arab states, and other relevant countries and in the economic, social, cultural, scientific, technical, educational, and health fields and an assessment of roadblocks to increased cooperation.

(3) An assessment of bilateral and multilateral security cooperation between Israel, the United States, Arab states, and other relevant countries and regions that have normalized relations with Israel, including an assessment of potential roadblocks to increased security cooperation, interoperability, and information sharing.

(4) An assessment of the likelihood of additional Arab and other relevant countries and regions to normalize relations with Israel.

(5) An assessment of opportunities created by normalization agreements with Israel to advance prospects for peace between Israelis and Palestinians.

(6) A detailed description of how the United States Government will leverage diplomatic lines of effort and resources from other stakeholders (including from foreign governments, international donors, and multilateral institutions) to encourage normalization, economic development, and people-to-people programming.

(7) Identification of existing investment funds that support Israel-Arab state cooperation and recommendations for how such funds could be used to support normalization and increase prosperity for all relevant stakeholders.

(8) A proposal for how the United States Government and others can utilize the scholars and Arabic language resources of the United States Holocaust Museum to counter Holocaust denial and anti-Semitism.

(9) An assessment for creating an Abrahamic Center for Pluralism to prepare educational materials, convene international seminars, promote tolerance and pluralism, and bring together scholars as a means of advancing religious tolerance and countering political and religious extremism.

(10) Recommendations to improve Department of State cooperation and coordination, particularly between the Special Envoy to Monitor Anti-Semitism and the Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom, and the Office of International Religious Freedom, to combat racism, xenophobia, Islamophobia, and anti-Semitism, which hinder improvement of relations between Israel, Arab states, and other relevant countries and regions.

(11) An assessment on the value and feasibility of Federal support for inter-parliamentary exchange programs for Members of Congress, Knesset, and parliamentarians from Arab and other relevant countries and regions, including through existing Federal programs that support such exchanges.

(c) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 1296. BREAKING DOWN BARRIERS TO NORMALIZATION WITH ISRAEL.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Strengthening Reporting of Actions Taken Against the Normalization of Relations with Israel Act of 2021''.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Arab League, an organization comprising 22 Middle Eastern and African countries and entities, has maintained an official boycott of Israeli companies and Israeli-made goods since the founding of Israel in 1948.

(2) Longstanding United States policy has encouraged Arab League states to normalize their relations with Israel and has long prioritized funding cooperative programs that promote normalization between Arab League States and Israel, including the Middle East Regional Cooperation program, which promotes Arab-Israeli scientific cooperation.

(3) While some Arab League governments are signaling enhanced cooperation with the state of Israel on the government-to-government level, most continue to persecute their own citizens who establish people-to-people relations with Israelis in nongovernmental fora, through a combination of judicial and extrajudicial retribution.

(4) Some Arab League states maintain draconian anti-normalization laws that punish their citizens for people-to-people relations with Israelis, with punishments, including imprisonment, revocation of citizenship, and execution. Extrajudicial punishments by these and other Arab states include summary imprisonment, accusations of ''treason'' in government-controlled media, and professional blacklisting.

(5) Anti-normalization laws, together with the other forms of retribution, effectively condemn these societies to mutual estrangement and, by extension, reduce the possibility of conciliation and compromise.

(6) Former Israeli President Shimon Peres said in 2008 at the United Nations that Israel agrees with the Arab Peace Initiative that a military solution to the conflict ''will not achieve peace or provide security for the parties''.

(7) Despite the risk of retaliatory action, a rising tide of Arab civic actors advocate direct engagement with Israeli citizens and residents. These include the Arab Council for Regional Integration, a group of 32 public figures from 15 Arab countries who oppose the boycott of Israel on the grounds that the boycott has denied Arabs the benefits of partnership with Israelis, has blocked Arabs from helping to bridge the Israeli-Palestinian divide, and inspired divisive intra-Arab boycotts among diverse sects and ethnic groups.

(8) On February 11, 2020, a delegation of the Arab Council to the French National Assembly in Paris testified to the harmful effects of ''anti-normalization laws'', called on the Assembly to enact a law instructing the relevant French authorities to issue an annual report on instances of Arab government retribution for any of their citizens or residents who call for peace with Israel or engage in direct civil relations with Israeli citizens, and requested democratic legislatures to help defend the region's civil peacemakers.

(9) On May 11, 2020, 85 leaders in France published an endorsement of the Arab Council's proposal, calling on France and other democratic governments to ''protect Arabs who engage in dialogue with Israeli citizens'' and proposing ''the creation of a study group in the National Assembly as well as in the Senate whose mission would be to ensure a legal and technical monitoring of the obstacles which Arab proponents of dialogue with Israelis face''.

(10) Arab-Israeli cooperation provides significant symbiotic benefit to the security and economic prosperity of the region.

(c) ADDITIONAL REPORTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for 5 years, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the status of efforts to promote normalization of relations with Israel and other countries.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following information:

(A) The status of ''anti-normalization laws'' in countries comprising the Arab League, including efforts within each country to sharpen existing laws, enact new or additional ''anti-normalization legislation'', or repeal such laws.

(B) Instances of the use of state-owned or state-operated media outlets to promote anti-Semitic propaganda, the prosecution of citizens or residents of Arab countries for calling for peace with Israel, visiting the state of Israel, or engaging Israeli citizens in any way.

(C) Instances of extrajudicial retribution by Arab governments or government-controlled institutions against citizens or residents of Arab countries for any of the same actions referred to in subparagraph (B).

SEC. 1297. SUNSET.

This subtitle shall cease to be effective on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 3927. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1064. NOTIFICATIONS AND REPORTS REGARDING REPORTED CASES OF BURN PIT EXPOSURE.

(a) QUARTERLY NOTIFICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On a quarterly basis, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on each reported case of burn pit exposure by a covered veteran reported during the previous quarter.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include, with respect to each reported case of burn pit exposure of a covered veteran included in the report, the following:

(A) Notice of the case, including the medical facility at which the case was reported.

(B) Notice of, as available—

(i) the enrollment status of the covered veteran with respect to the patient enrollment system of the Department of Veterans Affairs under section 1705(a) of title 38, United States Code;

(ii) a summary of all health care visits by the covered veteran at the medical facility at which the case was reported that are related to the case;

(iii) the demographics of the covered veteran, including age, sex, and race;

(iv) any non-Department of Veterans Affairs health care benefits that the covered veteran receives;

(v) the Armed Force in which the covered veteran served and the rank of the covered veteran;

(vi) the period in which the covered veteran served;

(vii) each location of an open burn pit from which the covered veteran was exposed to toxic airborne chemicals and fumes during such service;

(viii) the medical diagnoses of the covered veteran and the treatment provided to the veteran; and

(ix) whether the covered veteran is registered in the Airborne Hazards and Open Burn Pit Registry.

(3) PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that the reports submitted under paragraph (1) do not include the identity of covered veterans or contain other personally identifiable data.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT ON CASES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in collaboration with the Secretary of Defense, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report detailing the following:

(A) The total number of covered veterans.

(B) The total number of claims for disability compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, approved and the total number denied by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs with respect to a covered veteran, and for each such denial, the rationale of the denial.

(C) A comprehensive list of—

(i) the conditions for which covered veterans seek treatment; and

(ii) the locations of the open burn pits from which the covered veterans were exposed to toxic airborne chemicals and fumes.

(D) Identification of any illnesses relating to exposure to open burn pits that formed the basis for the Secretary to award benefits, including entitlement to service connection or an increase in disability rating.

(E) The total number of covered veterans who died after seeking care for an illness relating to exposure to an open burn pit.

(F) Any updates or trends with respect to the information described in subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), and (E) that the Secretary determines appropriate.

(2) MATTERS INCLUDED IN FIRST REPORT.—The Secretary shall include in the first report under paragraph (1) information specified in subsection (a)(2) with respect to reported cases of burn pit exposure made during the period beginning January 1, 1990, and ending on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) INCLUSION OF INFORMATION AFTER DEATH AND PROVISION OF INFORMATION REGARDING OPEN BURN PIT REGISTRY.—Section 201(a) of the Dignified Burial and Other Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–260; 38 U.S.C. 527 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(3) REPORTING OF INFORMATION AFTER DEATH.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall permit a survivor of a deceased veteran to report to the registry under paragraph (1) the exposure of the veteran to toxic airborne chemicals and fumes caused by an open burn pit, even if such veteran was not included in the registry before their death.

''(4) INFORMATION REGARDING REGISTRY.—

''(A) NOTICE.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that a medical professional of the Department of Veterans Affairs informs a veteran of the registry under paragraph (1) if the veteran presents at a medical facility of the Department for treatment that the veteran describes as being related to, or ancillary to, the exposure of the veteran to toxic airborne chemicals and fumes caused by open burn pits.

''(B) DISPLAY.—In making information public regarding the number of participants in the registry under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall display such numbers by both State and by congressional district.''.

(d) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing an assessment of the effectiveness of any memorandum of understanding or memorandum of agreement entered into by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs with respect to—

(1) the processing of reported cases of burn pit exposure; and

(2) the coordination of care and provision of health care relating to such cases at medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs and at non-Department facilities.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''Airborne Hazards and Open Burn Pit Registry'' means the registry established by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs under section 201 of the Dignified Burial and Other Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–260; 38 U.S.C. 527 note).

(2) The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate; and

(B) The Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(3) The term ''covered veteran'' means a veteran who presents at a medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs (or in a non-Department facility pursuant to section 1703 or 1703A of title 38, United States Code) for treatment that the veteran describes as being related to, or ancillary to, the exposure of the veteran to toxic airborne chemicals and fumes caused by open burn pits at any time while serving in the Armed Forces.

(4) The term ''open burn pit'' has the meaning given that term in section 201(c) of the Dignified Burial and Other Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–260; 38 U.S.C. 527 note).

(5) The term ''reported case of burn pit exposure'' means each instance in which a veteran presents at a medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs (or in a non-Department facility pursuant to section 1703 or 1703A of title 38, United States Code) for treatment that the veteran describes as being related to, or ancillary to, the exposure of the veteran to toxic airborne chemicals and fumes caused by open burn pits at any time while serving in the Armed Forces.

SA 3928. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1064. APPOINTMENT OF ULYSSES S. GRANT TO GRADE OF GENERAL OF THE ARMIES OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) On March 3, 1799, Congress created the grade of ''General of the Armies of the United States'' as the commander of the Army of the United States (5th Congress, Session III, Chap. 48, Section 9).

(2) On March 16, 1802, Congress effectively dissolved the grade of General of the Armies of the United States when it passed the Military Peace Establishment Act without reference to the grade (7th Congress, Session I, Chap. 9, Sec. 3).

(3) On July 1, 1843, Ulysses S. Grant graduated from the United States Military Academy at West Point, and, on July 31, 1854, Grant resigned from the Army at the grade of Captain.

(4) Following President Abraham Lincoln's April 15, 1861, proclamation calling for 75,000 volunteers to suppress Confederate forces, Ulysses S. Grant rejoined the Army and helped recruit and train volunteer soldiers for the Union.

(5) Over the course of the American Civil War, Ulysses S. Grant commanded a cumulative total of more than 600,000 Union soldiers and achieved major victories including Fort Henry (February 1862), Fort Donelson (February 1862), Shiloh (April 1862), the Vicksburg Campaign (November 1862–July 1863), Chattanooga (November 1863), the Wilderness Campaign (May 1864–June 1864), the Petersburg Campaign (June 1864–April 1865), and the Appomattox Campaign (April 1865).

(6) On February 29, 1864, Congress reestablished the grade of ''Lieutenant-General of

the United States Army'' and authorized the President to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an officer who was ''most distinguished for courage, skill, and ability'' (38th Congress, Session I, Chap. 14, Sec. 1); that same day, President Abraham Lincoln nominated Ulysses S. Grant to be Lieutenant-General.

(7) On March 10, 1864, President Abraham Lincoln formally appointed Ulysses S. Grant to the grade of Lieutenant-General of the Army, a position previously held by only George Washington and Winfield Scott, although Scott's promotion was a brevet appointment.

(8) On July 25, 1866, Congress established the grade of ''General of the Army of the United States'' (39th Congress, Session I, Chap. 232), and Ulysses S. Grant was appointed, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to General of the Army of the United States for his role in commanding the Union armies during the Civil War.

(9) On March 4, 1869, Ulysses S. Grant was sworn in as the 18th President of the United States.

(10) Throughout his two terms as President, Ulysses S. Grant secured the ratification of the 15th amendment to the Constitution, the creation of the Department of Justice, and the passage and implementation of the Civil Rights Act of 1875.

(11) On October 11, 1976, Congress enacted Public Law 94–479, which re-established the grade of ''General of the Armies of the United States'' to posthumously request the appointment of George Washington to General of the Armies of the United States and made clear that this grade has ''precedence over all other grades of the Army, past or present''.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to—

(1) honor Ulysses S. Grant for his efforts and leadership in defending the union of the United States of America;

(2) recognize that the military victories achieved under the command of Ulysses S. Grant were integral to the preservation of the United States of America; and

(3) affirm that Ulysses S. Grant is among the most influential military commanders in the history of the United States of America.

(c) APPOINTMENT.—The President is authorized and requested to appoint Ulysses S. Grant posthumously to the grade of General of the Armies of the United States, such appointment to take effect on April 27, 2022.

SA 3929. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 127, line 9, insert ''and a remedial investigation and feasibility study under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.)'' after ''testing''.

On page 127, line 11, insert ''and areas surrounding such installations and facilities'' after ''United States''.

On page 127, beginning on line 15, strike ''military installation or facility of the National Guard'' and insert ''military installation, facility of the National Guard, or surrounding area''.

On page 127, line 17, strike ''installation or facility'' and insert ''installation, facility, or area''.

On page 127, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following:

''(3) whether the release of a perfluoroalkyl substance or polyfluoroalkyl substance from the installation or facility has resulted in the occurrence of the perfluoroalkyl substance or polyfluoroalkyl substance in groundwater that is part of a sole-source aquifer at a concentration that presents a risk of exposure of a person to the substance in a quantity that exceeds the minimal risk level for that substance established by the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry.

On page 128, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

''(e) FINAL BASIS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION FOR ASSESSMENT AND TESTING BEFORE ENACTMENT.—If preliminary assessment and site inspection testing required by subsection (a) has been completed for an installation, facility, or area with respect to contamination from perfluoroalkyl substances and polyfluoroalkyl substances by the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022, such assessment and testing shall provide a final basis for alternative remedial actions necessary to address such contamination.

On page 128, line 14, strike the period and insert ''and the status of the selection by the Secretary of alternative remedial actions necessary to address contamination from perfluoroalkyl substances or polyfluoroalkyl substances at any installation, facility, or area covered by such testing.''.

On page 128, line 18, strike ''installation or facility'' and insert ''installation, facility, or area''.

On page 128, line 20, strike ''installation or facility'' and insert ''installation, facility, or area''.

On page 128, line 23, strike ''installations or facilities'' and insert ''installations, facilities, or areas''.

On page 129, beginning on line 1, strike ''installations or facilities'' and insert ''installations, facilities, or areas''.

On page 129, line 3, strike ''the actions'' and insert ''the remedial actions''.

On page 129, beginning on line 4, strike ''actions, for each installation or facility'' and insert ''remedial actions, for each installation, facility, or area''.

On page 129, line 13, insert after the period the following:

''(f) REMEDIAL ACTION DEFINED.—The term ''remedial action'' has the meaning given such term in section 101(24) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601(24)).

On page 135, strike ''locations'' and insert ''installations or facilities, including nearby areas surrounding such installations or facilities''.

On page 137, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

(51) Wright Patterson Air Force Base.

SA 3930. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5___. PILOT PROGRAM ON ACTIVITIES UNDER THE TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR A REDUCTION IN SUICIDE AMONG VETERANS.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of providing the module described in subsection (b) and the services described in subsection (c) as part of the Transition Assistance Program for members of the Armed Forces participating in the Transition Assistance Program as a means of reducing the incidence of suicide among veterans.

(b) MODULE.—The module described in this subsection is a three-hour module under the Transition Assistance Program for each member of the Armed Forces participating in the pilot program that includes the following:

(1) An in-person meeting between the cohort of the member and a social worker or mental health provider in which the social worker or mental health provider—

(A) counsels the cohort on specific potential risks confronting members after discharge or release from the Armed Forces, including loss of community or a support system, isolation from family, friends, or society, identity crisis in the transition from military to civilian life, vulnerability viewed as a weakness, need for empathy, self-medication and addiction, importance of sleep and exercise, homelessness, and reasons why veterans attempt and complete suicide;

(B) in coordination with the inTransition program of the Department of Defense, counsels members of the cohort who have been diagnosed with physical, psychological, or neurological issues, such as post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, adverse childhood experiences, depression, and bipolar disorder, on—

(i) the potential risks for such members from such issues after discharge or release; and

(ii) the resources and treatment options afforded to members for such issues through the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Defense, and non-profit organizations;

(C) counsels the cohort about the resources afforded to victims of military sexual trauma through the Department of Veterans Affairs; and

(D) counsels the cohort about the manner in which members might experience grief during the transition from military to civilian life, and the resources afforded to them for grieving through the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(2) In coordination with the Solid Start program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, the provision to each cohort member of contact information for a counseling or other appropriate facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs in the locality in which such member intends to reside after discharge or release.

(3) The submittal by cohort members to the Department of Veterans Affairs (including both the Veterans Health Administration and the Veterans Benefits Administration) of their medical records in connection with service in the Armed Forces, whether or not such members intend to file a claim with the Department for benefits with respect to any service-connected disability.

(c) SERVICES.—The services described in this subsection in connection with the Transition Assistance Program for each member of the Armed Forces participating in the pilot program are the following:

(1) Not later than 90 days after the discharge or release of the member from the

Armed Forces, a contact of the member by a social worker or behavioral health coordinator from the Department of Veterans Affairs to schedule a follow-up appointment with a social worker or behavioral health provider at the facility applicable to the member under subsection (b)(2) to occur not later than 90 days after such contact.

(2) During the appointment scheduled pursuant to paragraph (1)—

(A) an assessment of the member to determine the experiences of the member with events during service in the Armed Forces that could lead, whether individually or cumulatively, to physical, psychological, or neurological issues, including issues described in subsection (b)(1)(B); and

(B) the development of a medical treatment plan for the member, including treatment for issues identified pursuant to the assessment under subparagraph (A).

(d) LOCATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The pilot program shall be carried out at not fewer than 10 Transition Assistance Centers of the Department of Defense that serve not fewer than 300 members of the Armed Forces annually that are jointly selected by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for purposes of the pilot program.

(2) MEMBERS SERVED.—The centers selected under paragraph (1) shall, to the extent practicable, be centers that, whether individually or in aggregate, serve all the Armed Forces and both the regular and reserve components of the Armed Forces.

(e) SELECTION AND COMMENCEMENT.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly select the locations of the pilot program under subsection (d)(1) and commence carrying out activities under the pilot program by not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) DURATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The duration of the pilot program shall be five years.

(2) CONTINUATION.—If the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs recommend in the report under subsection (g) that the pilot program be extended beyond the date otherwise provided by paragraph (1), the Secretaries may jointly continue the pilot program for such period beyond such date as the Secretaries jointly consider appropriate.

(g) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter during the duration of the pilot program, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the activities under the pilot program.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the members of the Armed Forces who participated in the pilot program during the 180-day period ending on the date of such report, disaggregated by the following:

(i) Sex.

(ii) Branch of the Armed Forces in which served.

(iii) Diagnosis of, or other symptoms consistent with, military sexual trauma, posttraumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, depression, or bipolar disorder in connection with service in the Armed Forces.

(B) A description of the activities under the pilot program during such period.

(C) An assessment of the benefits of the activities under the pilot program during such period to veterans and family members of veterans.

(D) An assessment of whether the activities under the pilot program as of the date of such report have reduced the incidence of suicide among members who participated in the pilot program within one year of discharge or release from the Armed Forces.

(E) Such recommendations as the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs jointly consider appropriate regarding expansion of the pilot program, extension of the pilot program, or both.

(h) TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Transition Assistance Program'' means the program of assistance and other transitional services carried out pursuant to section 1144 of title 10, United States Code.

SA 3931. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1054. STUDY AND REPORT ON HOUSING AND SERVICE NEEDS OF SURVIVORS OF TRAFFICKING AND INDIVIDUALS AT RISK FOR TRAFFICKING.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In this section:

(A) SURVIVOR OF A SEVERE FORM OF TRAFFICKING.—The term ''survivor of a severe form of trafficking'' has the meaning given the term ''victim of a severe form of trafficking'' in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

(B) SURVIVOR OF TRAFFICKING.—The term ''survivor of trafficking'' has the meaning given the term ''victim of trafficking'' in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

(2) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (16), by striking ''paragraph (9)'' and inserting ''paragraph (11)''; and

(B) in paragraph (17), by striking ''paragraph (9) or (10)'' and inserting ''paragraph (11) or (12)''.

(b) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The United States Interagency Council on Homelessness (referred to in this section as the ''Council'') shall conduct a study assessing the availability and accessibility of housing and services for individuals experiencing homelessness or housing instability who are—

(A) survivors of trafficking, including survivors of a severe form of trafficking; or

(B) at risk of being trafficked.

(2) COORDINATION AND CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study required under paragraph (1), the Council shall—

(A) coordinate with—

(i) the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking established pursuant to section 105 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103);

(ii) the United States Advisory Council on Human Trafficking;

(iii) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;

(iv) the Secretary of Health and Human Services; and

(v) the Attorney General; and

(B) consult with—

(i) the National Advisory Committee on the Sex Trafficking of Children and Youth in the United States;

(ii) survivors of trafficking;

(iii) direct service providers, including—

(I) organizations serving runaway and homeless youth;

(II) organizations serving survivors of trafficking through community-based programs; and

(III) organizations providing housing services to survivors of trafficking; and

(iv) housing and homelessness assistance providers, including recipients of grants under—

(I) the continuum of care program authorized under subtitle C of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11381 et seq.); and

(II) the Emergency Solutions Grants Program authorized under subtitle B of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11371 et seq.).

(3) CONTENTS.—The study required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) with respect to the individuals described in such paragraph—

(i) an evaluation of formal assessments and outreach methods used to identify and assess the housing and service needs of such individuals, including outreach methods—

(I) to ensure effective communication with individuals with disabilities; and

(II) to reach individuals with limited English proficiency;

(ii) a review of the availability and accessibility of homelessness or housing services for such individuals, including the family members of such individuals who are minors involved in foster care systems, that identifies the disability-related needs of such individuals, including the need for housing with accessibility features;

(iii) the effect of any policies and procedures of mainstream homelessness or housing services that facilitate or limit the availability of such services and accessibility for such individuals, including individuals who are involved in the legal system, as such services are in effect as of the date on which the study is initiated;

(iv) an identification of best practices in meeting the housing and service needs of such individuals; and

(v) an assessment of barriers to fair housing and housing discrimination against survivors of trafficking who are members of a protected class under the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.);

(B) an assessment of the ability of mainstream homelessness or housing services to meet the specialized needs of survivors of trafficking, including trauma responsive approaches specific to labor and sex trafficking survivors; and

(C) an evaluation of the effectiveness of, and infrastructure considerations for, housing and service-delivery models that are specific to survivors of trafficking, including survivors of severe forms of trafficking, including emergency rental assistance models.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Council shall—

(1) submit a report to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives that contains the information described in subsection (b)(3); and

(2) make the report submitted under paragraph (1) publicly available.

SA 3932. Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by

Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title V, add the following:

SEC. 596. MODIFICATIONS TO MILITARY SERVICE UNIFORM REQUIREMENTS AND PROCEDURES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF CONSISTENT CRITERIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and in coordination with the Secretaries concerned with respect to the Armed Forces under their jurisdiction, shall establish consistent criteria for determining which uniform or clothing items across the services are considered uniquely military for purposes of calculating the standard cash clothing replacement allowances, in part to reduce differences in out-of-pocket costs incurred by enlisted members of the Armed Forces across the military services and by gender within a military service.

(2) REVIEW.—The Under Secretary shall review the criteria established under paragraph (1) every 5 years thereafter and recommend adjustments to enlisted clothing allowances if they are insufficient to pay for uniquely military items.

(b) ADDITIONAL REVIEWS.—The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and in coordination with the Secretaries of the military departments, shall—

(1) periodically review all uniform clothing plans of the military services to identify data and requirements needed to facilitate cost discussions and to recommend adjustments as appropriate;

(2) periodically review items in the military services' calculations of the enlisted standard cash clothing replacement allowances, at a minimum, every 5 years and develop a standard by which to identify significant cost differences that warrant being addressed;

(3) periodically review all plans of the military services for changing uniform items to determine if the planned changes will result in significant out of pocket cost differences among the services or among genders; and

(4) periodically review initial officer clothing allowances, at a minimum, every 10 years and identify requirements needed to facilitate cost discussions and adjustment recommendations as appropriate.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the cost of like items between genders should be the same for members of the Armed Forces.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2022, the Department of Defense, in coordination with the Secretaries of the military departments, shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the estimated production and average retail costs of military clothing items for members of each Armed Force, including both officer and enlisted uniforms, and a comparison of costs for both male and female military clothing items for members of each of the respective services.

SA 3933. Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. CRAMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title V, add the following:

SEC. 596. TERMINATION OF TELEPHONE, MULTICHANNEL VIDEO PROGRAMMING, AND INTERNET ACCESS SERVICE CONTRACTS BY SERVICEMEMBERS WHO ENTER INTO CONTRACTS AFTER RECEIVING MILITARY ORDERS FOR PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION BUT THEN RECEIVE STOP MOVEMENT ORDERS DUE TO AN EMERGENCY SITUATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 305A(a)(1) of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. 3956) is amended—

(1) by striking ''after the date the servicemember receives military orders to relocate for a period of not less than 90 days to a location that does not support the contract.'' and inserting ''after—''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(A) the date the servicemember receives military orders to relocate for a period of not less than 90 days to a location that does not support the contract; or

''(B) the date the servicemember, while in military service, receives military orders (as defined in section 305(i)) for a permanent change of station (as defined in section 305(i)), thereafter enters into the contract, and then after entering into the contract receives a stop movement order issued by the Secretary of Defense in response to a local, national, or global emergency, effective for an indefinite period or for a period of not less than 30 days, which prevents the servicemember from using the services provided under the contract.''.

(b) RETROACTIVE APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any stop movement order issued on or after March 1, 2020.

SA 3934. Mrs. HYDE-SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS: OTHER TRANSACTIONS TO SUPPORT NON-MILITARY MISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 763 of part IV of subtitle B of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 7545. Army Corps of Engineers: other transactions to support non-military mission

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army shall grant authority to the Corps of Engineers to use authority under section 2371b to enter into transactions (other than contracts, grants and cooperative agreements) to carry out prototype projects, including full-scale pilot demonstrations and follow-on activities, to enhance the effectiveness of the non-military mission of the Corps of Engineers in support of Federal agencies, State and local governments, Indian Tribes, private firms based in the United States, international organizations, and foreign governments.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of the Army shall ensure that any requirement of the Secretary of Defense relating to reports to Congress or education and training of personnel with respect to the use of other transaction authority shall apply to the authority granted to the Corps of Engineers under subsection (a).

''(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to Congress a report on the use of the authority granted to the Corps of Engineers under subsection (a).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 763 of part IV of subtitle B of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''7545. Army Corps of Engineers: other transactions to support non-military mission.''.

SA 3935. Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1064. UNITED STATES-ISRAEL CYBERSECURITY COOPERATION ENHANCEMENT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''United States-Israel Cybersecurity Cooperation Enhancement Act of 2021''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''cybersecurity research'' means research, including social science research, into ways to identify, protect against, detect, respond to, and recover from cybersecurity threats;

(2) the term ''cybersecurity technology'' means technology intended to identify, protect against, detect, respond to, and recover from cybersecurity threats;

(3) the term ''cybersecurity threat'' has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015 (6 U.S.C. 1501);

(4) the term ''Department'' means the Department of Homeland Security;

(5) the term ''National Laboratory'' has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801); and

(6) the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(c) GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary, in accordance with the agreement entitled the ''Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the State of Israel on Cooperation in Science and Technology for Homeland Security Matters'', dated May 29, 2008 (or successor agreement), and the requirements

specified in paragraph (2), shall establish a grant program at the Department to support—

(A) cybersecurity research and development; and

(B) demonstration and commercialization of cybersecurity technology.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) APPLICABILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in carrying out a research, development, demonstration, or commercial application program or activity that is authorized under this section, the Secretary shall require cost sharing in accordance with this paragraph.

(B) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the Secretary shall require not less than 50 percent of the cost of a research, development, demonstration, or commercial application program or activity described in subparagraph (A) to be provided by a non-Federal source.

(ii) REDUCTION.—The Secretary may reduce or eliminate, on a case-by-case basis, the percentage requirement specified in clause (i) if the Secretary determines that the reduction or elimination is necessary and appropriate.

(C) MERIT REVIEW.—In carrying out a research, development, demonstration, or commercial application program or activity that is authorized under this section, awards shall be made only after an impartial review of the scientific and technical merit of the proposals for the awards has been carried out by or for the Department.

(D) REVIEW PROCESSES.—In carrying out a review under subparagraph (C), the Secretary may use merit review processes developed under section 302(14) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 182(14)).

(3) ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS.—An applicant shall be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection if—

(A) the project of the applicant—

(i) addresses a requirement in the area of cybersecurity research or cybersecurity technology, as determined by the Secretary; and

(ii) is a joint venture between—

(I)(aa) a for-profit business entity, academic institution, National Laboratory, or nonprofit entity in the United States; and

(bb) a for-profit business entity, academic institution, or nonprofit entity in Israel; or

(II)(aa) the Federal Government; and

(bb) the Government of Israel; and

(B) neither the applicant nor the project of the applicant pose a counterintelligence threat, as determined by the Director of National Intelligence.

(4) APPLICATIONS.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, an applicant shall submit to the Secretary an application for the grant in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary, in consultation with the advisory board established under paragraph (5).

(5) ADVISORY BOARD.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish an advisory board to—

(i) monitor the method by which grants are awarded under this subsection; and

(ii) provide to the Secretary periodic performance reviews of actions taken to carry out this subsection.

(B) COMPOSITION.—The advisory board established under subparagraph (A) shall be composed of 3 members, to be appointed by the Secretary, of whom—

(i) 1 shall be a representative of the Federal Government;

(ii) 1 shall be selected from a list of nominees provided by the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation; and

(iii) 1 shall be selected from a list of nominees provided by the United States-Israel Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation.

(6) CONTRIBUTED FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(A) the Secretary may accept or retain funds contributed by any person, government entity, or organization for purposes of carrying out this subsection; and

(B) the funds described in subparagraph (A) shall be available, subject to appropriation, without fiscal year limitation.

(7) REPORTS.—

(A) GRANT RECIPIENTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of completion of a project for which a grant is provided under this subsection, the grant recipient shall submit to the Secretary a report that contains—

(i) a description of how the grant funds were used by the recipient; and

(ii) an evaluation of the level of success of each project funded by the grant.

(B) SECRETARY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter until the grant program established under this section terminates, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives a report on the grants awarded and projects completed under the program.

(8) CLASSIFICATION.—Grants shall be awarded under this subsection only for projects that are considered to be unclassified by both the United States and Israel.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section not less than $6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

SA 3936. Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Mr. CRAMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 583. EDUCATION AND INFANT AND EARLY CHILDHOOD MENTAL HEALTH CONSULTATION SERVICES FOR INFANT AND EARLY CHILDHOOD MENTAL HEALTH (IECMH).

(a) ASSESSMENT OF AVAILABILITY OF SERVICES.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a comprehensive assessment of the availability of Federal, State, and local early childhood education and infant and early childhood mental health (IECMH) consultation services on and in the vicinity of a covered military installation for identifying and addressing infant and early childhood mental health needs of children of members of the Armed Forces. This assessment shall include the following:

(1) The local availability of developmentally appropriate services advancing social and emotional development and infant and early childhood mental health of infants, toddlers, and young children, including certification or endorsement programs for professionals serving as infant early childhood mental health consultants for early education programs and centers.

(2) The local availability of adequate diagnostic and non-medical intervention services for infants, toddlers, or young children identified as requiring infant and early childhood mental health treatment.

(3) The local availability of supplemental services for infant and early childhood mental health such as Infant and Early Childhood Mental Health (IECMH) consultation by licensed professionals who are also certified or endorsed in IECMH.

(4) The ease of access for individuals with identified infant and early childhood mental health needs to adequate, comprehensive educational services, such as the length of time on waiting lists.

(b) REVIEW OF BEST PRACTICES.—In preparing the assessment under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall conduct a review of best practices of providing infant and early childhood mental health consultation in the United States in the provision of covered educational services and support services for infant and early childhood mental health, including an assessment of Federal and State early education and mental health services for infant and early childhood mental health in each State, with an emphasis on locations where members of the Armed Forces and their dependent children reside. The Secretary of Defense shall conduct the review in coordination with the Secretary of Education.

(c) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—

(1) PROJECTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Defense may conduct one or more demonstration projects to evaluate improved approaches to the provision of covered educational and infant and early childhood mental health services to children of members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of evaluating and the efficacy of infant and early childhood mental health consultation models to improve social-emotional development outcomes for military children enrolled in child development centers, reducing incidents of behavioral issues and or need for intensive treatment, and early identification of needs requiring non-medical intervention as considered appropriate by the Secretary.

(2) INFANT AND EARLY CHILDHOOD MENTAL HEALTH CONSULTATION.—

(A) CONSULTATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may authorize the development of a comprehensive professional development curricula for use in training non-medical counselors in infant and early childhood mental health and consultation to serve in child development centers, and to allow for the training of Department of Defense-contracted child and youth behavioral-military family life counselors as infant early childhood mental health consultants.

(ii) COMPETENCY GUIDELINES.— The curricula developed under clause (i) shall be based on a set of competency guidelines designed to enhance culturally sensitive, relationship-focused practice within the framework of infant and early childhood mental health recognized by authorizing agencies such as the Alliance for the Advancement of Infant Mental Health for purposes of certification or endorsement as a IECMH practitioner.

(B) PERSONNEL.—The Secretary of Defense may utilize for purposes of the demonstration projects personnel who are professionals with a level (as determined by the Secretary) of post-secondary education that is appropriate for the provision of safe and effective services for infant and early childhood mental health and who are from an accredited educational facility in the mental health, human development, social work field to act as consultation level providers of promotive, preventive, and behavioral non-medical intervention services within child development centers for infant and early childhood mental health. Such personnel may be authorized—

(i) to develop and monitor promotion, prevention, and non-medical intervention plans

for military children within child development centers who are participating in the demonstration projects;

(ii) to provide appropriate training in the provision of approved services to participating children;

(iii) to provide non-medical counseling services to children and their primary caregivers outside of the child development center as required;

(iv) to coordinate with other established installation and community resources to coordinate and collaborate regarding needed services, such as New Parent Support Program, Behavioral Health, Tricare mental health providers, HealthySteps, and early behavioral intervention services; and

(v) to be endorsed, or work toward becoming endorsed, by a recognized infant and early childhood mental health organization such as the Alliance for the Advancement of Infant Mental Health.

(3) EVALUATIONS OF OUTCOMES.—The Secretary of Defense may authorize an evaluation of outcomes from any demonstration project to determine the value of infant and early childhood mental health consultation within child development centers.

(4) SERVICES UNDER CORPORATE SERVICES PROVIDER MODEL.—In carrying out the demonstration projects, the Secretary of Defense may utilize a corporate services provider model. Employees of a provider under such a model shall include personnel who implement special educational and behavioral intervention plans for children of members of the Armed Forces that are developed, reviewed, and maintained by supervisory level providers approved by the Secretary. In authorizing such a model, the Secretary shall establish—

(A) minimum education, training, and experience criteria required to be met by employees who provide services to children;

(B) requirements for IECMH consultation personnel and supervision, including requirements for infant and early childhood mental health credentials and for the frequency and intensity of supervision; and

(C) such other requirements as the Secretary considers appropriate to ensure the safety and protection of children who receive services from such employees under the demonstration projects.

(5) PERIOD.—If the Secretary of Defense determines to conduct demonstration projects under this subsection, the Secretary shall commence such demonstration projects not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. The demonstration projects shall be conducted for not less than 2 years.

(6) EVALUATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct an evaluation of each demonstration project conducted under this section. The evaluation shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the extent to which the activities under the demonstration project contributed to positive outcomes for children of members of the Armed Forces.

(B) An assessment of the extent to which the activities under the demonstration project led to improvements in services and continuity of care for such children.

(C) An assessment of the extent to which the activities under the demonstration project improved military family readiness and enhanced military retention.

(d) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER BENEFITS.—Nothing in this section precludes the eligibility of members of the Armed Forces and their dependents for extended benefits under section 1079 of title 10, United States Code.

(e) REPORTS ON DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—Not later than 30 months after the commencement of any demonstration project under subsection (e), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the demonstration project. The report shall include a description of the project, the results of the evaluation under subsection (e)(5) with respect to the project, and a description of plans for the further provision of services for children of members of the Armed Forces under the project.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CHILD.—The term ''child'' has the meaning given that term in section 1072 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) COVERED EDUCATIONAL AND TREATMENT SERVICES.—The term ''covered educational and treatment services'' means provision of quality early childhood education that promotes healthy social and emotional development and provides supports for children experiencing mental health challenges and supportive services that include assessment, coaching for educators and parents, and when warranted, referral to appropriately licensed and specialized infant and early childhood mental health services for diagnosis, therapeutic treatment, and early intervention.

(3) COVERED MILITARY INSTALLATION.—The term ''covered military installation'' means a military installation at which at least 1,000 members of the Armed Forces are assigned who are eligible for an assignment accompanied by dependents.

(4) INFANT AND EARLY CHILDHOOD MENTAL HEALTH.—The term ''Infant and Early Childhood Mental Health'' (IECMH) means the developing capacity of the child, birth to age 5, to form close and secure adult and peer relationships, to experience, manage, and express a full range of emotions, and to explore the environment and learn, all in the context of family, community, and culture.

(5) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term ''local educational agency'' has the meaning given that term in section 8013(9) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7713(9)), except that the term includes publicly financed schools in communities, Department of Defense domestic dependent elementary and secondary schools, and schools of the defense dependents' education system.

SA 3937. Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Mr. CRAMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2803. TEMPORARY PROGRAM TO USE MINOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a program to carry out minor military construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, to construct child development centers.

(b) INCREASED MAXIMUM AMOUNTS APPLICABLE TO MINOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—For the purpose of any military construction project carried out under the program under this section, the amount specified in section 2805(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is deemed to be $15,000,000.

(c) NOTIFICATION AND APPROVAL REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The notification and approval requirements under section 2805(b) of title 10, United States Code, shall remain in effect for construction projects carried out under the program under this section.

(2) PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall establish procedures for the review and approval of requests from the Secretaries of military departments to carry out construction projects under the program under this section.

(d) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the program under this section.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include a list and description of the construction projects carried out under the program under this section, including the location and cost of each project.

(e) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority to carry out a minor military construction project under the program under this section expires on September 30, 2023.

(f) CONSTRUCTION OF AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit any other authority provided by law for a military construction project at a child development center.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER.—The term ''child development center'' includes a facility, and the utilities to support such facility, the function of which is to support the daily care of children aged six weeks old through 12 years old for full-day, part-day, and hourly service.

(2) CONGRESSIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEES.—The term ''congressional defense committees'' has the meaning given that term in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code.

SA 3938. Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title V, add the following:

SEC. 583. NON-MEDICAL COUNSELING SERVICES FOR MILITARY FAMILIES.

Section 1781 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) NON-MEDICAL COUNSELING SERVICES.—(1) In carrying out its duties under subsection (b), the Office may coordinate programs and activities for the provision of non-medical counseling services to military families through the Department of Defense Military and Family Life Counseling Program.

''(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a mental health professional described in paragraph (3) may provide non-medical counseling services at any location in a State, the District of Columbia, or a territory or possession of the United States, without regard to where the provider or recipient of such services is located, if the provision of such services is within the scope of the authorized Federal duties of the provider.

''(3) A mental health professional described in this subsection is a person who is—

''(A) a currently licensed or certified mental health care provider who holds an unrestricted license or certification that is—

''(i) issued by a State, the District of Columbia, or a territory or possession of the United States; and

''(ii) recognized by the Secretary of Defense;

''(B) a member of the uniformed services, a civilian employee of the Department of Defense, or a contractor designated by the Secretary; and

''(C) performing authorized duties for the Department of Defense under a program or activity referred to in paragraph (1).

''(4) In this subsection, the term 'non-medical counseling services' means mental health care services that are non-clinical, short-term, and solution-focused, and address topics related to personal growth, development, and positive functioning.''.

SA 3939. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. INSPECTOR GENERAL ACCESS ACT OF 2021.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Inspector General Access Act of 2021''.

(b) INVESTIGATIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE PERSONNEL.—Section 8E of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and paragraph (3)'';

(B) by striking paragraph (3);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(D) in paragraph (4), as redesignated, by striking ''paragraph (4)'' and inserting ''paragraph (3)''; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking '', except with respect to allegations described in subsection (b)(3),''.

SA 3940. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3867 submitted by Mr. REED and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4350, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1236 and insert the following:

SEC. 1236. SENSE OF SENATE ON CONTINUING SUPPORT FOR ESTONIA, LATVIA, AND LITHUANIA.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the security of the Baltic region is crucial to the security of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization alliance, and the United States should continue to prioritize support for efforts by the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania to build and invest in critical security areas, as such efforts are important to achieving United States national security objectives, including deterring Russian aggression and bolstering the security of North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies;

(2) robust support to accomplish United States strategic objectives, including by providing assistance to the Baltic countries through security cooperation referred to as the Baltic Security Initiative pursuant to sections 332 and 333 of title 10, United States Code, should be prioritized in the years to come;

(3) Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania play a crucial role in strategic efforts—

(A) to deter the Russian Federation; and

(B) to maintain the collective security of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization alliance;

(4) the United States should continue to pursue efforts consistent with the comprehensive, multilateral assessment of the military requirements of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania provided to Congress in December 2020;

(5) the Baltic security cooperation roadmap has proven to be a successful model to enhance intraregional Baltic planning and cooperation, particularly with respect to longer-term regional capability projects, including—

(A) integrated air defense;

(B) maritime domain awareness;

(C) command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance; and

(D) Special Operations Forces development;

(6) Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are to be commended for their efforts to pursue joint procurement of select defense capabilities and should explore additional areas for joint collaboration; and

(7) the Department of Defense should—

(A) continue robust, comprehensive investment in Baltic security efforts consistent with the assessment described in paragraph (4);

(B) continue efforts to enhance interoperability among Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and in support of North Atlantic Treaty Organization efforts;

(C) encourage infrastructure and other host-country support improvements that will enhance United States and allied military mobility across the region;

(D) invest in efforts to improve resilience to hybrid threats and cyber defenses in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; and

(E) support planning and budgeting efforts of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania that are regionally synchronized.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I have 11 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 27, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a nomination hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 27, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 27, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 27, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 27, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 27, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 27, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 27, 2021, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 27, 2021, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPE AND REGIONAL SECURITY COOPERATION

The Subcommittee on Europe and Regional Security Cooperation of the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 27, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND BORDER MANAGEMENT

The Subcommittee on Government Operations and Border Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 27, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

DAY OF THE DEPLOYED

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 429, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 429) designating October 26, 2021, as the ''Day of the Deployed''.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BROWN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 429) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

NATIONAL DYSLEXIA AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 430, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 430) calling on Congress, schools, and State and local educational agencies to recognize the significant educational implications of dyslexia that must be addressed, and designating October 2021 as ''National Dyslexia Awareness Month''.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 430) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2021

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, October 28; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Williams nomination; further, that at 11 a.m., the Senate vote on the confirmation of the Williams, Olsen, and Schroeder nominations, in the order listed; that upon disposition of the Schroeder nomination, the Senate resume consideration of the Dellinger nomination, postcloture; that at 2:30 p.m., the Senate vote on confirmation of the Dellinger and Prelogar nominations prior to votes on the motions to invoke cloture on the Robinson and Heytens nominations, all in the order listed below; further, that if cloture is invoked on the nominations during Thursday's session, all postcloture time expire immediately, the Senate vote on confirmation of the nominations at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Republican leader; finally, if any nominations are confirmed during Thursday's session, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. For the information of Senators, there will be three rollcall votes starting at 11 a.m., and four rollcall votes at 2:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:41 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, October 28, 2021, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

MARTHA WILLIAMS, OF MONTANA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, VICE AURELIA SKIPWITH.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MICHELE TAYLOR, OF GEORGIA, FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HER TENURE OF SERVICE AS UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL.

BETH VAN SCHAAK, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR AT LARGE FOR GLOBAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

LAUREL A. BLATCHFORD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE CONTROLLER, OFFICE OF FEDERAL FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, VICE DAVID ARTHUR MADER.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CINDY K. CHUNG, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE SCOTT W. BRADY, RESIGNED.

GREGORY K. HARRIS, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JOHN C. MILHISER, RESIGNED.

PHILIP R. SELLINGER, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE PAUL JOSEPH FISHMAN, RESIGNED.

GARY M. RESTAINO, OF ARIZONA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE MICHAEL G. BAILEY, RESIGNED.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. COLLIN P. GREEN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be colonel

ROBERT J. ABBOTT
MATTHEW H. ADAMS
LARRY A. BABIN, JR.
RYAN BEERY
CAROL A. BREWER
NAGESH CHELLURI
JEROME P. DUGGAN
MATTHEW S. FITZGERALD
RICHARD E. GORINI
JOHN J. GOWEL
KATHERINE S. GOWEL
NATHAN P. JACOBS
KEIRSTEN H. KENNEDY
ANDREW K. KERNAN
MATTHEW A. KRAUSE
GARY R. LEVY, JR.
JOHN R. MALONEY
DARREN W. POHLMANN
KRISTY L. RADIO
PHYLISHA A. SOUTH
MEGAN WAKEFIELD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS A CHAPLAIN UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be major

TANYA K. BINDERNAGEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be major

GRANT T. ALEXIS
PHILIP L. AUBART
MARC C. BEAUDOIN
MORGHAN E. BEAUDOIN
EMILY E. BOBENRIETH
GRACI E. BOZARTH
JASON D. BRUNER
JENNIFER L. BRYER
PATRICK M. CALES
ETHAN S. CHAE
JOAN E. COLLOTON
JESSE L. CORNETT
MARCUS R. DEEL
JONATHAN S. DEMILLE
STEPHEN C. DIMPSEY
MELVIN L. DUNSWORTH
TIFFANY M. ESTES
JULIA M. FARINAS
MATTHEW E. FAUST
STEPHEN M. FELLOWS
ANNA P. FEYGINA
GAELAN P. FLANNERY
RACHAEL D. FLANNERY
DRU M. FOSTER
EMMA K. FOWLER
DANIEL FRANCOSANTIAGO
JACOB J. HALVERSON
DANIELLE N. HAYNES
NATALIA K. HELMSING
ALEXANDER E. HERNANDEZ
SOPHIA L. K. HILDRETH
KYLE F. HOFFMANN
THOMAS F. HOWE
DARRON J. HUBBARD
CHAUNCEY S. HUSTED
BENJAMIN M. JOSLIN
JASON R. JUCH
DAVID A. KAUFMAN
RYAN J. KEETER
JAMES M. KIERNAN
JUSTIN M. KMAN
BENJAMIN J. KOENIGSFELD
IAN M. LAWSON
ROBERT M. LEEDHAM
JAYNE A. LEEMON
BRADLEY E. LEWIS
THOMAS C. LEWIS
JOSEPH D. LIBRANDE
JOHN R. LYSTASH
CORY A. MAGGIO
KAREY B. MARREN
AMANDA L. MCMENAMIN
KEVIN S. MILLER
JEFFREY M. MOCK
DUSTIN L. MORGAN
ANDREW E. NIST
NICOLE A. OBERJUERGE
DENISE Y. QUINTANA
ZACHARY J. RAY
SOSTEN R. RIVALE
LYNMARIE RIVERAMARTINEZ
SAMUEL C. RODDY
CHASE C. ROLLS
ALLISON L. ROWLEY
ALEXANDER G. SALLOUM
CHRISTINA L. SCHWENNSEN
JOSEPH A. SEATON, JR.

ELIZABETH G. SMITHAM
MARK E. STARCHMAN
CODY C. STEEN
JOSHUA R. STORM
EVIN C. STOVALL
JENNIFER A. SUNDOOK
LAUREN M. TEEL
BRIAN C. TRACY
THOMAS J. TRAVERS
AMANDA A. UWAIBI
TODD M. VLAZNY
CHRISTOPHER K. WILLS
THOMAS J. WITKOWSKI

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 716:

To be major

TROY J. JOHNSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MARY T. GUEST

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ERIC J. JORDAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

ZACHARY P. AUGUSTINE
CHRISTOPHER JAMES BAKER
BRIAN V. BANAS
PATRICIA A. GRUEN
ERICA L. HARRIS
RYAN D. HILTON
JASON F. KEEN
BRETT A. LANDRY
DUSTIN C. LANE
JAMES R. LISHER II
SHELLY STOKES MCNULTY
SARAH M. MOUNTIN
NINA R. PADALINO
JENNIFER E. POWELL
MICHAEL T. RAKOWSKI
RENEE DIANE SALZMANN
CHRISTOPHER JOSEPH SCHUBBE
PATRICK M. SCHWOMEYER
DARRIN M. SKOUSEN
MAXWELL S. SMART
LEAH M. SPRECHER
MATTHEW D. TALCOTT
BRIAN D. TETER
MICHAEL L. TOOMER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

CHAD A. BELLAMY
JASON MCKINLEY BOTTS
GLENN B. BRIGHT
CHRISTIAN J. CHAE
ROLF E. HOLMQUIST
JONATHAN R. HURT
ERIK W. NELSON
REGINA O. SAMUEL
RUTH N. SEGRES
WILLIAM R. SPENCER
ANDREW L. THORNLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

ROSS ANDREW BROWN
JASMINE N. CANDELARIO
RICHARD PIN CHEN
HEATHER NOELLE CORROTHERS
BENJAMIN HARRIS DEYOUNG
SETH WOODRUFF DILWORTH
MICAH WAYNE ELGGREN
JANE A. ELZEFTAWY
JAMES PETER FERRELL
ANTONIO FORNASIER
DAVID LINDSTROM FOX
CASEY JOHN GROHER
PETER FITZGERALD HAVERN
ANDREA MARIE HUNWICK
KENNETH JAMES HYLE III
BRETT AUSTIN JOHNSON
TIFFANY A. JOHNSON
ANDREW JOHN KASMAN
DUSTIN B. KOUBA
ALEXANDER LEONARDO LOWRY
MICAH MCMILLAN
JEREMY LEE MOONEY
VY S. NGUYEN
CHRISTINE L. NORTON
PHILLIP NORMAN PADDEN
NICHOLAS DAVID PETERSON
MICHAEL ADAM PIERSON
BRADLEY L. PORONSKY
MICHAEL JOSEPH RAMING
RYAN MARCUS REED
JOHN STEWART REID
LAUREN E. ROSENBLATT
JAMES RONALD STEELMAN III
VALYNCIA SHANEE HIL THOMAS
TAREN E. WELLMAN
EMILY MARIE WILSON
LISA MARIE WOTKOWICZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

KIP T. AVERETT
JEREMY V. BASTIAN
SCOTT CHRISTOPHER BRILL
GARRELL D. CALTON
MICHAEL JAMES CAREY
JUSTIN P. COMBS
KRISTI L. HOPP
MARK R. JUCHTER
RONALD S. KISER
PAUL P. LOSER
DEREK S. MARLEY
DAVID VINCENT MCGUIRE
CHAD S. MONTGOMERY
AMBER L. MURRELL
ZACHARY LANIER NASH
JAMES MICHAEL PITTS
CHRISTOPHER L. REEDER
JOHN D. RITTER
KYLE L. ROEHRIG
TIMOTHY T. SESSIONS
KRAIG ALAN SMITH
JON WARD SMITHLEY
KELLY D. STAHL
JOSHUA M. STOLEY
DANIEL S. WALKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

SHAWN J. ALVES
JON W. ANDERSON
DAVID R. BARNES
AMANDA C. BARRETOHOLDER
DANIEL P. BEAULIEU
JAMES L. BEISSNER
CHARLES RHODES BERRY
CHELSEA D. BESHORE
CORTLAND T. BOBCZYNSKI
KOLEY ALAN BORCHARD
WILLIS R. BROWN
AARON M. BRYNILDSON
HEATHER M. CAINE
JOSEPH M. CAPPOLA
MATTHEW EDWARD CAREY
DANIEL S. CARRAWAY
MATTHEW A. COLE
RYAN S. CRNKOVICH
CELENE DELICE
KRISTIAN C. DIGGS
NATALIA A. ESCOBAR
RYAN M. FARRELL
CHRISTOPHER J. GINN
RILEY A. GRABER
RAMIRO VILLARREAL GUERRERO
HEATHER M. HATHAWAY
JOSHUA D. HEADRICK
CHARLTON SAMUEL HEDDEN
SARA J. HICKMON
HEATHER M. HOUSEAL
FREDERICK J. JOHNSON
MELISSA L. KEN
ASHLEY M. KING
JAMES A. KLINEDINST
JUNGMOO LEE
KESHAT S. LEMBERG
STEPHANIE L. LESSNAU
LOGAN W. LILES
FELICIA LATRELL LOGAN
MILES CODY MCCOY
SEAN R. MCDIVITT
ADAM M. MERZEL
CHRISTOPHER DOUGLAS MITCHELL
JUSTIN MITCHELL
KEVIN L. MITCHELL
AMY MONDRAGON
BALAJI L. NARAIN
MARC G. NEVINS
NATHANAEL D. OKHUYSEN
CATHARINE D. PALS
LINDSEY K. PARSONS
ANTHONY P. PELLEGRINI
CHELSEA A. PERDUE
KATHRYN E. PRICE
JASMINE J. PROKSCHA
LAURA M. QUACO
KYLE R. RATLIFF
PETER S. REITH
ANTHONY F. ROCK
FELIX R. RODRIGUEZ CARTAGENA
ANDREW J. ROMEY
STEPHAN A. RYDER
MATTHEW W. SCHUYLER
BENJAMIN C. SIGNER
AMY LIANA SIMPSON
JILLIAN N. SLOAN
SUNG UN SMITH
TYLER JUSTIN SMITH
VICTORIA DANIELLE H. SMITH
ADAM P. STOHLER
MEGAN M. TEEPLE
TABITHA B. WHITE
ALEXANDER J. ZOLL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

PATRICK E. BRACKEN
RICHARD S. CASEY
CHRISTOPHER M. DELUISE
PETER JARAMILLO DUMAG
IOAN IRINEL DUMITRASCU
MATTHEW DUSSIA
KARLTON L. EDISON
MICHAEL LYNN FARAR
THOMAS STEVEN FOLEY
KIMBERLY HALL
JEFFREY M. HILL
DAVID S. KEEL
CHARLES CHOONGIL KIM
DOUGLAS E. LUMPKIN
WILLIAM E. MCMULLAN
ROBERT D. MOHR
EMMANUEL OKWARAOCHA
CYRIACUS NZUBE ONYEJEGBU
THOMAS A. PECK
ROBERT LEE PITTS
JESSICA S. PROPHITT
JOHN M. RICHARDSON
PHILIP NORMAN SMITH
PAUL ROBERT SNYDER
TIMOTHY DANIEL SPRINGS
KRISTIN D. SWENSON
JAMES E. TAYLOR III
BEDEMOORE UDECHUKWU
THADDAEUS J. WERNER

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 605:

To be lieutenant commander

STEPHEN M. DYER

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO BE A CONSULAR OFFICER AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

ADAM JEFFREY ABRAMSON, OF VIRGINIA
KIRSTIN R. ADAMOWICZ, OF VIRGINIA
SCOTT C. ALEXANDER, OF VIRGINIA
TANNER ALLEN, OF VIRGINIA
KATHERINE MARIE ANDERSON, OF VIRGINIA
CAMERON RAY ARIAS, OF VIRGINIA
TRACY L. ARMSTRONG, OF VIRGINIA
ANNIE LEE ASPENSON, OF VIRGINIA
CATHERINE MARIE BAKER, OF MARYLAND
SARAH E. BALLARD, OF VIRGINIA
CAROLINE CARDENAS BARBOSA, OF VIRGINIA
ASIA MONIQUE BARKER, OF VIRGINIA
BRANDON S. BARKER, OF VIRGINIA
GRACE K. BARRERA, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER JAMES BARROW, OF VIRGINIA
ZERLINA ELYSE BARTHOLOMEW, OF KENTUCKY
DEVIN MARGARET BEAUMIER, OF VIRGINIA
JEREMY ADAM BECK, OF VIRGINIA
RUSSELL WILBERT BECK, OF VIRGINIA
SARAH KAY BECKER, OF VIRGINIA
MONICA NICOLE BEHN, OF FLORIDA
THEODORE ALBERT EDWARD BELL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CHARLES P. BESNARD, OF MASSACHUSETTS
DEA MARIE BONASSO, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES ARCH BONNEY, OF VIRGINIA
TEECIE PAIGE BROWN, OF VIRGINIA
THOMAS BROWNBACK, OF VIRGINIA
COREY BURTON, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL N. BUTLER, OF VIRGINIA
JESSICA ANN CASH, OF VIRGINIA
CONSTANZA VALENTINA CASTRO ZUNIGA, OF MISSOURI
SRAVANTI CHAGANTI, OF VIRGINIA
JAD CHAMSEDDINE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
HAWHWA HELEN CHENG, OF VIRGINIA
JESSE HAN CHO, OF VIRGINIA
ERIC VINCENT CINA, OF VIRGINIA
SARA TERESA COCCIA, OF VIRGINIA
MARJORIE H. COHEN, OF VIRGINIA
LAWRENCE N. COIG IV, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
RICHARD P. COMBS, OF VIRGINIA
ADAM T. COOK, OF VIRGINIA
GABRIEL CORTEZ, OF ARIZONA
COLE M. COX, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER D. CRAMER, OF PENNSYLVANIA
ANDREW A. CRECELIUS, OF INDIANA
TORREY L. CUNNINGHAM, OF VIRGINIA
JESSICA LINDSAY CUSANO, OF VIRGINIA
KAITLIN E. CUTAIAR, OF VIRGINIA
VERONICA M. CZASTKIEWICZ, OF VIRGINIA
ACHILLE G. DAGO, OF VIRGINIA
DIANE LINDA DANDRIDGE, OF VIRGINIA
JUSTIN MICHAEL DAVID, OF CALIFORNIA
DAVID P. DELVECCHIO, OF TEXAS
DALE DEPOY, JR., OF VIRGINIA
JOEL O. DEVER, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREA P. DHAMER, OF TEXAS
KATHLEEN MARY QUINN EAKINS, OF VIRGINIA
TAYLOR EBERT, OF VIRGINIA
JUSTIN T. ERICKSON, OF MICHIGAN
HEATHER M. EVANS, OF VIRGINIA
SCOTT EDMUND EVANS, OF VIRGINIA
KENNETH JACK EWER, OF VIRGINIA
PHILLIP A. FALSON, OF VIRGINIA
TYRONE CARLOS FARIAS, OF VIRGINIA
GAVIN R. FIELD, OF VIRGINIA

SUSAN STANCAMPIANO FORTNAM, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL G. FOX, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
GUS FREDERICK, OF VIRGINIA
JEAN C. GARCIA, OF VIRGINIA
ERIC A. GAULT, OF VIRGINIA
MEAGHEN A. GEINERT, OF VIRGINIA
MOJIB ZIARMAL GHAZNAWI, OF MASSACHUSETTS
HANNAH BLYTHE GOBLE, OF VIRGINIA
DEBRA C. GOLDSCHLAG, OF VIRGINIA
SOFIA NANCY GOMEZ, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
WILLIAM GONZALEZ–RAMOS, OF VIRGINIA
SEAN GRAHAM, OF VIRGINIA
REBECCA MICHELLE GREEN, OF ARIZONA
JORDAN MONTGOMERY GRIMSHAW, OF VIRGINIA
JESSICA LUZ GUMUCIO, OF NORTH CAROLINA
KEVIN ANDREW HAGEL, OF MARYLAND
PHILMON GHIRMAI HAILE, OF WASHINGTON
DONALD LEE HARRIS, JR., OF VIRGINIA
JACK M. HARRIS, OF VIRGINIA
JULIE LYNN HAY, OF VIRGINIA
MARGARET ELIZA HERING, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN DAVID HOFFMAN, OF VIRGINIA
PAUL WESLEY HOFFMAN, OF VIRGINIA
WILLIAM C. HOLLOWAY, OF VIRGINIA
AMBROSIA MARIE HOPKINS, OF VIRGINIA
CLARISSA NICOLE HUGHES, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MICHAEL HUTCHINGS II, OF VIRGINIA
ALLEN MIGUEL IRWIN, OF VIRGINIA
DARREN ANDREW JACKSON, OF VIRGINIA
RENE AUGUSTO JAVIER ORONOZ, OF VIRGINIA
KEVIN JIANG, OF VIRGINIA
PAULA ALLECIA MISHEL JONES, OF OKLAHOMA
SARA KATHRYN JUBACK, OF VIRGINIA
PASSION I. JULINSEY, OF WASHINGTON
DANE EDWARD KAEHLER, OF VIRGINIA
LUKE AKIRA KAEMPFER, OF VIRGINIA
KEVIN PATRICK KALLMYER, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN D. KAUFFMAN, OF VIRGINIA
JOSHUA VICTOR KELLER, OF VIRGINIA
JONATHAN LEE KHALIFE, OF VIRGINIA
BEHROUZ KIANIAN, OF GEORGIA
REBEKAH JANE KILROY, OF VIRGINIA
CAROLINE JUHYUNG KIM, OF CALIFORNIA
MCCORY RANDOLPH KING, OF VIRGINIA
JOSEPH DANIEL KLEMANN, OF VIRGINIA
AMANDA N. KNIGHTON, OF VIRGINIA
TIMOTHY CARL ABRAHAM KROBOTH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
RANDAL LABINE, OF VIRGINIA
SHERRY ISABEL LAN, OF VIRGINIA
WILLIAM P. LANGLEY, OF VIRGINIA
CHAD LATINO, OF VIRGINIA
EMILY S. LAURITS, OF VIRGINIA
BRADLEY R. LAWRENCE, OF VIRGINIA
CHENOA MICHELLE LEE, OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS
JANE E. LEE, OF VIRGINIA
NICOLE A. LEE, OF VIRGINIA
ROSAMARINA LEIVA, OF VIRGINIA
HANNAH GABRIELLE LITKOWSKI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KRISTEN REBECCA LOBECK, OF VIRGINIA
TYLER P. LOGAN, OF VIRGINIA
MEREDITH LYNN LOHWASSER, OF VIRGINIA
JORGE R. LOPEZ, OF TEXAS
KELLY ESTELLE LUCKAM, OF VIRGINIA
KEVA DENICIA LUKE, OF NEW YORK
MIRANDA GRACE LUPION, OF VIRGINIA
TRAVIS RICHARD MACIEL, OF VIRGINIA
JAY CURTIS MALLORY, OF VIRGINIA
SARAH A. MANNING, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MAXWELL ALAN MARTIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JESSICA ELAINE LEE MARTIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MICHELLE L. MASSEY, OF MARYLAND
JOSHUA PAUL MAY, OF VIRGINIA
STEVEN RAY MAZUR, OF VIRGINIA
DANIEL J. MCGOWN, JR., OF VIRGINIA
XAVIER MCNULTY, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES MAURICE MERRITT, SR., OF VIRGINIA
WILLIAM H. METZLER, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREW ERNEST MINEER, OF VIRGINIA
KEVIN R. MOORE, OF COLORADO
JENNIFER ELIZABETH MOORE, OF VIRGINIA
SHARYN M. MORIN, OF VIRGINIA
ALEXANDRA MOSENSON, OF VIRGINIA
ABDUALRAHMAN HAYTHAM MUHIALDIN, OF TEXAS
RUBEN DIMAS MURRAY, OF NEW YORK
DAVID LATRELL MYERS, JR., OF VIRGINIA
SABRINA A. NEWTON, OF VIRGINIA
BRIAN GEORGE NICHOLAS, OF VIRGINIA
ADAM J. NIELSON, OF VIRGINIA
CAROLYNN ROCHELLE NIXON, OF GEORGIA
HUGH P. O'BRIEN, OF VIRGINIA
HAYDEN CHRISTOPHER OLENIK, OF VIRGINIA
KATHRYN S. OLSON, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT W. ORTON, OF MAINE
PAMELA S. PARKS, OF VIRGINIA
SHIVANI KAUSHIK PATEL, OF VIRGINIA
JULIE ANN PATTERSON, OF WASHINGTON
MATTHEW RAY PEARSON, OF VIRGINIA
JEREMY JAMES PETT, OF VIRGINIA
TRAVIS R. POST, OF TEXAS
MEGAN PYE, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL CONOR REILLY, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREA RIETH, OF VIRGINIA
MATTHEW ALBERT RITCHIE, OF VIRGINIA
KETYLLEN ROBINSON, OF VIRGINIA
ERIC GREGORY ROGERS, OF VIRGINIA
SIRI JEANETTE ROMA, OF VIRGINIA
MEGAN LEIGH ROTH, OF VIRGINIA
HEATHER R. ROWAN, OF VIRGINIA
SHELDON KENDALL RUBY, OF PENNSYLVANIA
TERISA RUPP, OF VIRGINIA
JARRED T. SABIA, OF GEORGIA
SANDRA LEIGH SAMSON, OF VIRGINIA
JONATHAN SHANE SANDERS, OF VIRGINIA
SYDNEY ELIZABETH SCARLATA, OF ILLINOIS
SUZANNE ELIZABETH SCHAEFER, OF VIRGINIA
PHANNY N. SCHINNER, OF VIRGINIA
OLIVIA KASEN SEGAL, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREW PARKER SELLERS, OF VIRGINIA
THEODORE T. SENASU, OF ILLINOIS
BRETT SHACKELFORD, OF VIRGINIA
TAYLOR REES SHAPIRO, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID B. SHAW, OF COLORADO
WILLIAM DANA SHIMER, OF VIRGINIA
THOMAS N. SIBLEY, OF VIRGINIA
JEFFREY LEONARD SIMMONS, JR., OF ALABAMA
LAUREN HARTWELL SMITH, OF VIRGINIA
JOSEPH L. SMYTH, OF VIRGINIA
SHIVSHANKAR SRIKANTH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
PEGGY L. STOKKE, OF VIRGINIA
TERRY L. STUDER, OF VIRGINIA
SUSAN M. SULLIVAN, OF VIRGINIA
IVAN SUSAK, OF VIRGINIA
AMINATA SY, OF PENNSYLVANIA
LAUREN WENDTH TADKEN, OF VIRGINIA
DOUGLAS JAY TANNER, OF VIRGINIA
TENZIN DAWA THARGAY, OF MASSACHUSETTS
MICHELLE TINKER, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL C. TROSSMAN, OF VIRGINIA
KYLIE LAN T. TUMIATTI, OF FLORIDA
TRACEY ANN VALERIO, OF TEXAS
JENNIFER F. VANDEVER, OF WEST VIRGINIA
ZACHARY CLAY VANNOY, OF VIRGINIA
MONICA VEGA HERRERA, OF GEORGIA
GEORGE T. VELLIOS, OF VIRGINIA
TIFFANY THONGPITE VENMAHAVONG, OF RHODE ISLAND
CHRISTOPHER ALBERT VESPI, OF VIRGINIA
DEREK J. VOISIN, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES LEONARD WALL, OF VIRGINIA
SARAH ROSE WARBURTON, OF VIRGINIA
JAN WASZKIEWICZ, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHEN WEATHERLY, OF VIRGINIA
MAUREEN ERIN WEINERT, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN JAMES WEST, OF VIRGINIA
CHANDRA A. WHALEN, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
NICHOLAS C. WHEELER, OF VIRGINIA
MELISSA J. WHITNEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JONATHAN K. WILLIAMS, OF VIRGINIA
VICTORIA WISEMAN, OF VIRGINIA
MADELEINE LEIGH WRIGHT, OF VIRGINIA
VICTOR C. YAU, OF TEXAS
GREGORY S. YELLEN, OF VIRGINIA
SCOTT WILLIAM YURCHESHEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JESSICA TORRES YURCHESHEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

MARIO D. AMBROSINO, OF CALIFORNIA
ABRAHAM INOUYE, OF VIRGINIA
JOSEPH MICHAEL RAGOLE, OF ARIZONA
MARIUSZ TADYCH, OF NEW JERSEY
JOSEPH M. VUKOVICH, OF HAWAII
CRISTOBAL ZEPEDA, OF COLORADO

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

SCOTT BRUNS, OF FLORIDA

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

NICHOLAS R. ABBATE, OF NEW JERSEY
JESSICA EDITH AKPAN, OF VIRGINIA
JUSTIN H. ALLEN, OF VIRGINIA
SARAH BRITTANY ANCAS, OF PENNSYLVANIA
WILLIAM S. ANDERSON, OF WASHINGTON
LAURA JULIA ARRIAZA–ROHT, OF CALIFORNIA
DAVID ALAN BAKER, OF VIRGINIA
KIMBERLY A. BARONE, OF PENNSYLVANIA
GREGORY M. BAUER, OF VIRGINIA
LARA E. BELL, OF TEXAS
MADELINE REISING BENNETT, OF TEXAS
MICHAEL D. BERENTSON, OF WASHINGTON
SHALEEN J. BRUNSDALE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CLINTON CANADY IV, OF TEXAS
ELIZABETH PATRICIA CARDONE, OF NEW YORK
JESSICA G. COPELAND, OF COLORADO
ALEXANDRE J. COTTIN, OF VIRGINIA
MATTHEW S. COULSON, OF TEXAS
MATTHEW A. DEAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
WILLIAM ERNEST DENHAM IV, OF TEXAS
MARCY E. DUPALO, OF VIRGINIA
ANNA EROKHINA, OF VIRGINIA
ALAN JOSEPH M. FLESCH, OF OKLAHOMA
HARRIS L. GARCIA, OF TEXAS
SARABRYNN M. HUDGINS, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
NICHOLAS J. JAGER, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID C. KISSLING, OF WASHINGTON
WILLIAM B. LANGAN, OF FLORIDA
IVERSON BRYANS LONG, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
MATTHEW J. MAUNTEL–MEDICI, OF IOWA
MUHAMMAD AMMAR M. MUYEED, OF TEXAS
LAURIE JOHNSON MYNATT, OF FLORIDA
AMANDA LUCILLE NELSON–DUAC, OF TEXAS
HENRY T. NUNLEY, OF OKLAHOMA
MARI KATHERINE M. OYE, OF MASSACHUSETTS
NICHOLAS L. PARKER, OF CALIFORNIA
NICOLE SUNE SBITANI, OF VIRGINIA
JOSEPH A. SCOTT, OF UTAH
CHARLES V. SELBY III, OF PENNSYLVANIA
TAYLOR STEWART SMITH, OF VIRGINIA
TYE C. SUNDLEE, OF WASHINGTON
ASHLIE K. TATTERSALL, OF NEW YORK
DAGMARA KARLA TCHALAKOV, OF INDIANA
LEE M. THOMPSON, OF TEXAS
PETER CHRISTOPHER TIERNEY, OF NORTH CAROLINA
ERIN CARNEY TRAMONTOZZI, OF TEXAS
BRICE CAMERON TURNER, OF FLORIDA
MUSTAFA A. VAHANVATY, OF CALIFORNIA
JOSHUA PAUL WELSH, OF FLORIDA
SONIA A. WETTSTEIN, OF NEW YORK
PATRICK C. WILCOX, OF TEXAS
MICHAEL D. ZGODA, OF NEW YORK

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, AND TO BE A CONSULAR OFFICER AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

MARIA E. SNARSKI, OF VIRGINIA

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 27, 2021:

THE JUDICIARY

MICHAEL S. NACHMANOFF, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA.

SARALA VIDYA NAGALA, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT.